arXiv:1302.5093v4 [math.CA] 28 Mar 2013

A two weight theorem for α-fractional singular integrals: an expanded version

Eric T. Sawyer

Chun-Yen Shen

Ignacio Uriarte-Tuero

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4K1
E-mail address: `sawyer@mcmaster.ca`

Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University, East Lansing MI
E-mail address: `cyshen@math.mcmaster.ca`

Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University, East Lansing MI
E-mail address: `ignacio@math.msu.edu`

Research supported in part by NSERC.
I. Uriarte-Tuero has been partially supported by grants DMS-1056965 (US NSF), MTM2010-16232, MTM2009-14694-C02-01 (Spain), and a Sloan Foundation Fellowship.

Abstract. Let σ and ω be locally finite positive Borel measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with no common point masses, and let $\mathbf{R}^\alpha$ be the vector of α-fractional Riesz transforms on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. Furthermore, assume as side conditions the α-*functional energy condition* and its dual. Then we show that $\mathbf{R}^\alpha_\sigma$ is bounded from $L^2(\sigma)$ to $L^2(\omega)$ if and only if the $\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2$ and cube testing conditions hold for $\mathbf{R}^\alpha_\sigma$. Moreover, if T^α is a standard α-fractional Calderón-Zygmund operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$, then T^α_σ is bounded from $L^2(\sigma)$ to $L^2(\omega)$ if $\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2$, the cube testing conditions for T^α_σ, and the α-functional energy conditions all hold. Conversely, if $\mathbf{R}^\alpha_\sigma$ is bounded from $L^2(\sigma)$ to $L^2(\omega)$, then the $\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2$ condition holds.

The innovations in this higher dimensional setting are the Monotonicity Lemma using special Haar functions, the necessity of the $\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2$ conditions, and the extension of certain one-dimensional arguments to higher dimensions. The main obstacle in higher dimensions is thus identified as the pair of functional energy conditions. The arguments of our indicator/interval paper with M.Lacey, along with the argument used by M. Lacey in his recent solution of the NTV conjecture, are then adapted to higher dimensions. However, as the arguments are intricate and technical, we give here an expanded version of the proof that includes additional detail for some of the arguments already in the literature.

Contents

Preface v

Part 1. Indicator/interval testing for the Hilbert transform 1

Chapter 1. Introduction 3

Chapter 2. Bounded fluctuation and functional energy 13
  1. Bounded fluctuation 13
  2. Functional energy 14
  3. Outline of the proof 15

Chapter 3. Preliminaries of the proof 17
  1. Monotonicity property 17
  2. Energy lemma 20
  3. The good-bad decomposition 26

Chapter 4. Intertwining proposition and functional energy 29
  1. Intertwining proposition 30
  2. Controlling functional energy 39

Chapter 5. Decomposing the functions 53
  1. Bounded fluctuation 53
  2. Minimal bounded fluctuation 55
  3. The energy corona and stopping form 63
  4. The parallel triple corona decomposition 64

Chapter 6. Interval size splitting 71
  1. Reduction to stopping forms 73
  2. Boundedness of the $\mathcal{MBF}/L^2$ stopping form 74
  3. Boundedness of the $\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}$ stopping form 76

Part 2. A two weight theorem for α-fractional singular integrals in $\mathbb{R}^n$ 79

Chapter 7. New results for Calderón-Zygmund operators 81
  1. Necessity of the $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ conditions 83
  2. A weighted Haar basis 87
  3. Monotonicity lemma and Energy lemma 88
  4. Functional energy and the energy condition 91

Chapter 8. Basic constructs 97
  1. The parallel corona splitting 97

2. Bounded fluctuation 99
3. Standard preliminaries and outline of the proof 100

Chapter 9. Adapting the one-dimensional indicator/interval argument 105
1. Intertwining proposition 105
2. Bounded fluctuation decomposition 107
3. The energy corona and stopping form decomposition 109
4. The parallel corona splitting of the double corona decompositions 110
5. A further application of functional energy and cube size splitting 112

Chapter 10. The stopping time and recursion of M. Lacey 115
1. Additivity of projections 115
2. The stopping energy 116
3. The recursion 117

Appendix. Bibliography 127

Preface

In this paper we prove a two weight inequality for standard Calderón-Zygmund operators T in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, where we assume a side condition, namely the *functional energy conditions*. More specifically, we show that for locally finite Borel measures σ and ω with no common point masses, and assuming the functional energy conditions (see Definition 18 below or e.g. [**LaSaShUr2**]), a standard Calderón-Zygmund operator T is bounded from $L^2(\sigma)$ to $L^2(\omega)$ *if and only if* the $\mathcal{A}_2$ conditions and the following cube testing conditions all hold:

$$\int_Q \left|T\left(\mathbf{1}_Q\sigma\right)\right|^2 \omega \leq \int_Q d\sigma \text{ and } \int_Q \left|T^*\left(\mathbf{1}_Q\omega\right)\right|^2 \sigma \leq \int_Q d\omega,$$

for all cubes Q. This result extends also to standard α-fractional singular integrals in the range $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, and clearly identifies the culprit in higher dimensions as the pair of functional energy conditions. While these conditions are necessary in dimension $n = 1$, we do not know if they are necessary when $n > 1$. Finally, we point out that the functional energy conditions are implied by essentially all of the other side conditions used previously in two weight theory, in particular by the Energy Hypothesis (1.16) in [**LaSaUr**].

The recent proof by M. Lacey [**Lac**] of the Nazarov-Treil-Volberg conjecture for the Hilbert transform is the culmination of a large body of work on two-weighted inequalities beginning with the work of Nazarov, Treil and Volberg ([**NaVo**], [**NTV1**], [**NTV2**], [**NTV4**] and [**Vol**]) and continuing with that of Lacey and the authors ([**LaSaUr1**], [**LaSaUr**], [**LaSaShUr**] and [**LaSaShUr2**]), just to mention a few. See the references for further work. For the convenience of the reader, we include an expanded version of our paper joint with M. Lacey [**LaSaShUr2**] on the indicator/interval characterization for the Hilbert transform, and an expanded adaptation to the Riesz transforms of Lacey's subsequent solution to the NTV conjecture for the Hilbert transform [**Lac**]. More precisely, we present the proof our result in two parts.

1. In **Part 1** we expand the proof of the *indicator/interval* characterization of the two weight inequality for the Hilbert transform obtained by M. L. Lacey, E. T. Sawyer, C.-Y. Shen and I. Uriarte-Tuero [**LaSaShUr2**]. Our presentation is taken from a preprint [**Saw**] posted in 2012 on one of the author's websites, and presents the proof in a slightly different way using a parallel triple corona.
2. In **Part 2** we consider standard singular integrals T, as well as their α-fractional counterparts T^α, and begin by proving the necessity of the $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ condition for the boundedness of the vector of α-fractional Riesz transforms $\mathbf{R}^\alpha$, and a Monotonicity Lemma using special Haar functions. These are the main innovations in this paper. We then adapt the arguments in

Part 1, and the clever stopping time and recursion arguments of M. Lacey [**Lac**], to prove our theorem.

The basic idea of the generalization is that all of the decompositions of functions are carried out independently of α, while the estimates of the resulting nonlinear forms depend on the α-Poisson integral and the α-energy conditions. We now describe our theorem in the case $\alpha = 0$ for standard singular integrals.

For any cube Q and any positive Borel measure μ, let

$$\mathrm{P}\left(Q,\mu\right)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{\left|Q\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left(\left|Q\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}+\left|x-x_Q\right|\right)^{n+1}}d\mu\left(x\right)$$

be the Poisson integral of μ at the point $(x_Q, |Q|)$ in the upper half space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. We also let

$$\left\|\mathsf{P}^\mu_I\mathbf{x}\right\|^2_{L^2(\mu)}\equiv\int_I\left|\mathbf{x}-\left(\frac{1}{\left|I\right|_\mu}\int_I\mathbf{x}dx\right)\right|^2d\mu\left(x\right),\qquad\mathbf{x}=\left(x_1,...,x_n\right),$$

be the orthogonal projection of the identity function $\mathbf{x}:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^n$ onto the vector-valued subspace of $\oplus_{k=1}^n L^2\left(\mu\right)$ consisting of functions supported in I with μ-mean value zero. Let $\mathcal{Q}^n$ denote the collection of all cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$. A more general theorem for fractional singular integrals is stated and proved in Part 2.

THEOREM 1. *Suppose T is a standard Calderón-Zygmund operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and suppose that ω and σ are positive Borel measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ without common point masses. Furthermore, we suppose that the functional energy constants $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^*$ defined in Definition 18 below (with $\alpha = 0$) are finite. Then*

(1) *The operator T_σ is bounded from $L^2\left(\sigma\right)$ to $L^2\left(\omega\right)$, i.e.*

$$\left\|T_\sigma f\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}\leq\mathfrak{N}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)},$$

and moreover

$$\mathfrak{N}\leq C\left(\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2+\mathcal{A}_2^*}+\mathfrak{T}+\mathfrak{T}_*+\mathfrak{F}+\mathfrak{F}^*\right),$$

provided that

(a) *the two dual $\mathcal{A}_2$ conditions hold,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_2&\equiv\sup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}^n}\mathrm{P}\left(Q,\sigma\right)\frac{\left|Q\right|_\omega}{\left|Q\right|}<\infty,\\ \mathcal{A}_2^*&\equiv\sup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}^n}\frac{\left|Q\right|_\sigma}{\left|Q\right|}\mathrm{P}\left(Q,\omega\right)<\infty,\end{aligned}$$

(b) *and the two dual testing conditions hold,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{T}^2&\equiv\sup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}^n}\frac{1}{\left|Q\right|_\sigma}\int_Q\left|T\left(\mathbf{1}_Q\sigma\right)\right|^2\omega<\infty,\\ \mathfrak{T}_*^2&\equiv\sup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}^n}\frac{1}{\left|Q\right|_\omega}\int_Q\left|T^*\left(\mathbf{1}_Q\omega\right)\right|^2\sigma<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

(2) *Conversely, suppose $\left\{T_j\right\}_{j=1}^J$ is a collection of Calderón-Zygmund operators with standard kernels $\left\{K_j\right\}_{j=1}^J$, and that there is $c>0$ such that for* each *unit vector $\mathbf{u}$ there is j satisfying*

$$\left|K_j\left(x,x+t\mathbf{u}\right)\right|\geq ct^{-n},\qquad t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{0.1}$$

Furthermore, assume that each operator T_j *is bounded from* $L^2(\sigma)$ *to* $L^2(\omega)$,

$$\left\|(T_j)_\sigma f\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq \mathfrak{N} \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} .$$

Then the two dual $\mathcal{A}_2$ *conditions hold, and moreover,*

$$\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_2^*} \leq C\mathfrak{N}.$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 1. *We thank Michael Lacey for showing us a counterexample to the Monotonicity Property as formulated in the first version of this paper on the* arXiv, *and also for pointing to a problem with the summing of Poisson tails in the third version of this paper on the* arXiv.

Part 1

Indicator/interval testing for the Hilbert transform

In this first part of the paper, we reproduce an expanded version of the *indicator/interval* characterization obtained in [**LaSaShUr2**] by M. L. Lacey, E. T. Sawyer, C.-Y. Shen and I. Uriarte-Tuero. This 71 page expanded version [**Saw**] was created in March 2012, posted on one of the author's websites, and then a slight revision reposted in September 2012.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

We give a version of the proof, with expanded details and additional background, of the real variable characterization of the two weight inequality for the Hilbert transform given in [**LaSaShUr2**] by M. L. Lacey, E. T. Sawyer, C.-Y. Shen and I. Uriarte-Tuero. There is also a slight reorganization of the proof as given in [**LaSaShUr2**]. All of the arguments here are due to Lacey, Sawyer, Shen and Uriarte-Tuero, but any errors, omissions and/or confusion introduced into this expanded version are due to the last three authors alone.

Let $H\nu\left(x\right)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{d\nu(y)}{y-x}$ be the Hilbert transform of the measure ν. The principal value associated with this definition need not exist in general, so we always understand that there is a fixed standard truncation of the kernel in place here. Given weights (i.e. locally bounded positive Borel measures) σ and ω on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ with no common point masses, we characterize the following *two weight norm inequality* for the Hilbert transform,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|H\left(f\sigma\right)\right|^{2}\omega\leq\mathfrak{N}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|f\right|^{2}\sigma,\qquad f\in L^{2}\left(\sigma\right),\tag{0.2}$$

uniform over all standard truncations of the Hilbert transform kernel. A question raised in [**Vol**], which we refer to as the *NTV conjecture*, is whether or not (0.2) is equivalent to the following necessary conditions (see [**NTV4**] and [**LaSaUr**] for the necessity of $\mathcal{A}_2<\infty$),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}\left(I,\sigma\right)\frac{\left|I\right|_{\omega}}{\left|I\right|}&\leq\mathcal{A}_{2},\quad\frac{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}{\left|I\right|}\mathrm{P}\left(I,\omega\right)\leq\mathcal{A}_{2},\\ \int_{I}\left|H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I}\sigma\right)\right|^{2}\omega&\leq\mathfrak{T}^{2}\left|I\right|_{\sigma},\quad\int_{I}\left|H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I}\omega\right)\right|^{2}\sigma\leq\left(\mathfrak{T}^{*}\right)^{2}\left|I\right|_{\omega},\end{aligned}\tag{0.3}$$

called the $\mathcal{A}_2$ condition and the two interval testing conditions. A weaker conjecture is the *indicator/interval NTV conjecture* in which the interval testing conditions are replaced by the indicator/interval testing conditions

$$\int_{I}\left|H\left(\mathbf{1}_{E}\sigma\right)\right|^{2}\omega\leq\mathfrak{T}_{ind}^{2}\left|I\right|_{\sigma},\quad\int_{I}\left|H\left(\mathbf{1}_{E}\omega\right)\right|^{2}\sigma\leq\left(\mathfrak{T}_{ind}^{*}\right)^{2}\left|I\right|_{\omega},$$

for all E compact $\subset I$ interval. Note that E does not appear on the right side of the inequalities, and that for a *positive* operator H, the indicator/interval and interval testing conditions are the same. It is an elementary exercise to establish the equivalence of the indicator/interval testing condition with

$$\int_{I}\left|H\left(f\mathbf{1}_{I}\sigma\right)\right|^{2}\omega\leq\mathfrak{T}_{ind}^{2}\left|I\right|_{\sigma},\quad\int_{I}\left|H\left(f\mathbf{1}_{I}\omega\right)\right|^{2}\sigma\leq\left(\mathfrak{T}_{ind}^{*}\right)^{2}\left|I\right|_{\omega},\tag{0.4}$$

for all intervals I and functions f with $|f| \leq 1$. Indeed, given $g \in L^2(\omega)$ and I an interval, define $F_{g,I} = \frac{H_\omega(\chi_I g)}{|H_\omega(\chi_I g)|}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{|f|\leq 1} \left(\int_I H(\chi_I f\sigma)^2 \omega \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sup_{|f|\leq 1} \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\leq 1} \left| \int_I H(\chi_I f\sigma) g\omega \right| \\
&= \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\leq 1} \sup_{|f|\leq 1} \left| \int_I H(\chi_I g\omega) f\sigma \right| = \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\leq 1} \int_I H(\chi_I g\omega) F_{g,I}\sigma \\
&= \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\leq 1} \int_I H(\chi_I F_{g,I}\sigma) g\omega \leq \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\leq 1} \left(\int_I H(\chi_I F_{g,I}\sigma)^2 \omega \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $F_{g,I}$ takes on only the values ± 1, it is easy to see that we can take $f = \chi_E$ in (0.4) if we double the constant.

In this paper we prove the *indicator/interval NTV conjecture.*

THEOREM 2. *Let σ and ω be locally finite positive Borel measures on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ with no common point masses. The best constants $\mathfrak{N}$, $\mathcal{A}_2$, $\mathfrak{T}_{ind}$, and $\mathfrak{T}_{ind}^*$ in (0.2), (0.3) and (0.4) satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{N} \approx \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2} + \mathfrak{T}_{ind} + \mathfrak{T}_{ind}^*.$$

Since the constant on the right side above arises repeatedly throughout the paper, we set $\mathfrak{NTV}_{ind} = \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2} + \mathfrak{T}_{ind} + \mathfrak{T}_{ind}^*$. We also set $\mathfrak{NTV} = \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2} + \mathfrak{T} + \mathfrak{T}^*$. Here is an operator theoretic consequence of the theorem.

COROLLARY 1. *Let σ and ω be locally finite positive Borel measures on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ with no common point masses. Denote by $\mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathfrak{W}^*$ the weak type $(2,2)$ norms of H_σ and H_ω respectively, i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda \ |\{|H(f\sigma)| > \lambda\}|_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \mathfrak{W} \ \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \qquad f \in L^2(\sigma), \\
\lambda \ |\{|H(g\omega)| > \lambda\}|_\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \mathfrak{W}^* \ \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}, \qquad g \in L^2(\omega).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{N} \approx \mathfrak{W} + \mathfrak{W}^*.$$

The corollary follows from the theorem since duality and the theory of Lorentz spaces give $\mathfrak{T}_{ind} \leq \mathfrak{W}^*$ and $\mathfrak{T}_{ind}^* \leq \mathfrak{W}$; while $\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2} \lesssim \mathfrak{W} + \mathfrak{W}^*$ is evident from the proof of $\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2} \lesssim \mathfrak{N}$ in [**LaSaUr**].

Finally, current interest in the two weight problem for the Hilbert transform arises from its natural occurrence in questions related to operator theory [**NiTr**], spectral theory, model spaces [**NaVo**], and analytic function spaces [**LySe**], among others.

0.1. A brief history of the problem.

The two weight norm inequality (0.2) for the Hilbert transform became recognized as a difficult problem shortly after the classical one-weight problem was solved in 1973 by R. Hunt, B. Muckenhoupt and R.L. Wheeden [**HuMuWh**]. While success in related two weight problems for positive operators came relatively quickly in the early 1980's in [**Saw1**] and [**Saw3**], the case of singular integrals remained mysterious for some time. Progress in a different direction was achieved by David and Journé in 1984 when they solved in [**?**] the norm inequality for general Calderon-Zygmund operators, but with Lebesgue measure as the weights. It was not until the late 1990's and early this millenium that significant inroads were made in the singular two weight problem by F. Nazarov, S. Treil and A. Volberg using their recently developed techniques for harmonic analysis on nondoubling spaces, see e.g. [**NaVo**], [**NTV1**] and [**NTV2**].

This effort culminated in the beautiful arguments in the 2004 preprint [**NTV4**] and 2003 CBMS book [**Vol**], in which NTV followed the form of characterizations in [**Saw1**], [**Saw3**] and [**DaJo**], by showing that (0.2) was implied by (0.3) if certain side conditions were imposed, namely the pivotal condition,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left|J_n\right|_{\omega} \mathrm{P}\left(J_n, \mathbf{1}_I \sigma\right)^2 \lesssim \left|I\right|_{\sigma} , \qquad \dot{\bigcup}_{n=1}^{\infty} J_n \subset I,$$

and its dual. The proof analyzed the bilinear form $\left\langle H_\sigma f, g\right\rangle_\omega$ by expanding f and g in random Haar bases,

$$\left\langle H_\sigma f, g\right\rangle_\omega = \sum_{I,J} \left\langle H_\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f, \triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega ,$$

splitting the forms into upper and lower and diagonal forms according to the relative lengths of the dyadic intervals I and J, and then using a new corona argument that involved stopping times defined with respect to the pivotal condition.

In [**LaSaUr**], three of us showed that the pivotal conditions were not necessary for (0.2), and weakened these side conditions extensively, but were not able to completely eliminate them. Also in that paper, the concept of the energy

$$\mathsf{E}\left(J, \omega\right) = \left\{ \frac{1}{\left|J\right|_\omega} \int_J \left(\mathbb{E}_J^{\omega(dx')} \frac{x - x'}{\left|J\right|} \right)^2 d\omega\left(x\right) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

of a weight ω on an interval J was introduced, and the energy versions of the pivotal conditions were shown to be necessary for 0.2, namely

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left|J_n\right|_{\omega} \mathsf{E}\left(J_n, \omega\right)^2 \mathrm{P}\left(J_n, \mathbf{1}_I \sigma\right)^2 \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right) \left|I\right|_{\sigma} , \qquad \dot{\bigcup}_{n=1}^{\infty} J_n \subset I,$$

and its dual condition. However, superadditivity of the functional $J \rightarrow \left|J\right|_\omega$ appearing in the pivotal condition was a crucial property for the NTV proof strategy, which involved a clever estimate of off-diagonal terms in the Haar expansion of the bilinear form $\left\langle H_\sigma f, g\right\rangle_\omega$. Unfortunately, this crucial property fails for the corresponding functional $J \rightarrow \left|J\right|_\omega \mathsf{E}\left(J, \omega\right)^2$ appearing in the energy condition, and the sufficiency proof stalled dued to inadequate control of the energy stopping time coronas.

Both the pivotal and energy stopping times used in [**NTV4**] and [**LaSaUr**] depend only on the weights ω and σ, and not on the functions f and g involved in the form. In [**LaSaShUr**] the current authors introduced Calderón-Zygmund stopping times into the argument, which had been previously used for maximal truncations of Hilbert transform in [**LaSaUr1**], and which depend on the averages of the moduli of the functions involved. But the failure of the weights ω and σ to be doubling presented a formidable obstacle in [**LaSaShUr**] just as in [**LaSaUr1**], and moreover, this approach highlighted the fact that the splitting of the form $\left\langle H_\sigma f, g\right\rangle_\omega$ according to relative lengths of the intervals I and J might *not* be a bounded operation in general, hence dooming this splitting from the start (see [**LaSaShUr**] for more detail on the question of bounding the split forms, which remains open at the time of this writing).

0.1.1. *Circumventing the obstacles.* The difficulties mentioned above are circumvented in the present paper by introducing a new splitting of the bilinear form, followed by a careful analysis of the extremal functions that fail both the energy and Calderón-Zygmund stopping time methodology. The new splitting is the *parallel corona* splitting that involves defining upper and lower and diagonal forms relative to the tree of Calderón-Zygmund stopping time intervals, rather than the full tree of dyadic intervals. Recall that the enemy of Calderón-Zygmund stopping times is degeneracy of the doubling property, while the enemy of energy stopping times is degeneracy of the energy functional (since nondegenerate doubling implies nondegenerate energy, it is really the failure of doubling in both weights that is the common enemy). A series of three reductions are then performed with Calderón-Zygmund and energy parallel coronas to identify the extremal functions that fail to yield to the standard analyses, such as certain bounded functions, and functions of *minimal bounded fluctuation* with energy control. In the end, the standard NTV methodology is decisive when used on these extremal functions with very special structure.

0.2. The parallel corona decomposition. The main construction in our proof of Theorem 2 is the following parallel corona decomposition, which improves the decomposition according to interval side length that has been used in all previous papers, in particular in [**NTV4**], [**LaSaUr**] and [**LaSaShUr**]. Let $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ be an r-good pair of grids, and let $\{h_I^{\sigma}\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}}$ and $\{h_J^{\omega}\}_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}$ be the corresponding Haar bases, so that

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} \triangle_I^{\sigma} f = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} \langle f, h_I^{\sigma}\rangle \ h_I^{\sigma} = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} \widehat{f}(I)\ h_I^{\sigma}, \\ g &= \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \triangle_J^{\omega} g = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \langle g, h_J^{\omega}\rangle \ h_J^{\omega} = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \widehat{g}(J)\ h_J^{\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where the appropriate grid is understood in the notation $\widehat{f}(I)$ and $\widehat{g}(J)$. It is convenient to define $H_{\sigma}f \equiv H(f\sigma)$ so that the dual operator H_{σ}^{*} is H_{ω}: $\langle H_{\sigma}f, g\rangle_{\omega} = \langle f, H_{\omega}g\rangle_{\sigma}$.

Inequality (0.2) is equivalent to boundedness of the bilinear form

$$\mathcal{H}(f,g) \equiv \langle H_{\sigma}(f), g\rangle_{\omega} = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma} \text{ and } J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \langle H_{\sigma}(\triangle_I^{\sigma} f), \triangle_J^{\omega} g\rangle_{\omega}$$

on $L^2(\sigma)\times L^2(\omega)$, i.e.

$$|\mathcal{H}(f,g)| \leq \mathfrak{N} \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} .$$

Virtually all attacks on the two weight inequality (0.2) to date have proceeded by first splitting the bilinear form $\mathcal{H}$ into three natural forms determined by the relative size of the intervals I and J in the inner product:

$$\begin{aligned}
(0.5)\qquad \mathcal{H} &= \mathcal{H}_{lower}+\mathcal{H}_{diagonal}+\mathcal{H}_{upper};\\
\mathcal{H}_{lower}(f,g) &\equiv \sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}\text{ and }J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}\\ |J|<2^{-r}|I|}} \left\langle H_{\sigma}\left(\triangle_I^{\sigma}f\right),\triangle_J^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega},\\
\mathcal{H}_{diagonal}(f,g) &\equiv \sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}\text{ and }J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}\\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^{r}|I|}} \left\langle H_{\sigma}\left(\triangle_I^{\sigma}f\right),\triangle_J^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega},\\
\mathcal{H}_{upper}(f,g) &\equiv \sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}\text{ and }J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}\\ |J|>2^{r}|I|}} \left\langle H_{\sigma}\left(\triangle_I^{\sigma}f\right),\triangle_J^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega},
\end{aligned}$$

and then continuing to establish boundedness of each of these three forms. Now the boundedness of the diagonal form $\mathcal{H}_{diagonal}$ is an automatic consequence of that of $\mathcal{H}$ since it is shown in [**NTV4**] that

$$\left|\mathcal{H}_{diagonal}(f,g)\right|\lesssim\left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right)\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\lesssim\mathfrak{N}\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}.$$

However, it is *not* known if the boundedness of $\mathcal{H}_{lower}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{upper}$ follow from that of $\mathcal{H}$, which places in jeopardy the entire method of attack based on the splitting (0.5) of the form $\mathcal{H}$. See [**LaSaShUr**] for a detailed discussion of these matters.

In order to improve on the splitting in (0.5), we introduce stopping trees $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ for the functions $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g\in L^2(\omega)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ (respectively $\mathcal{G}$) be a collection of Calderón-Zygmund stopping intervals for f (respectively g), and let $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}=\bigcup_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{C}_F$ (respectively $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}=\bigcup_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{C}_G$) be the associated corona decomposition of the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ (respectively $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$). For $I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ let $\pi_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}}I$ be the $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$-parent of I in the grid $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$, and let $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}I$ be the smallest member of $\mathcal{F}$ that contains I. For $F,F'\in\mathcal{F}$, we say that F' is an $\mathcal{F}$-child of F if $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}\left(\pi_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}}F'\right)=F$ (it could be that $F=\pi_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}}F'$), and we denote by $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ the set of $\mathcal{F}$-children of F. For $F\in\mathcal{F}$, define the projection $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}$ onto the linear span of the Haar functions $\left\{h_I^{\sigma}\right\}_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}$ by

$$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}f=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\triangle_I^{\sigma}f=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\left\langle f,h_I^{\sigma}\right\rangle_{\sigma}h_I^{\sigma}.$$

The standard properties of these projections are

$$f=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}f,\qquad\int\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}f\right)\sigma=0,\qquad\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\left\|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2.$$

There are similar definitions and formulas for the tree $\mathcal{G}$ and grid $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$.

REMARK 1. *The stopping intervals $\mathcal{F}$ live in the full dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$, while the intervals $I\in\mathcal{C}_F$ are restricted to the* good *subgrid $\mathcal{D}_{good}^{\sigma}$ as defined in Subsection 3 below. It is important to observe that the arguments used in this paper never appeal to a 'good' property for stopping intervals, only for intervals in the Haar support of f. A similar remark applies to $\mathcal{G}$ and the Haar support of g.*

We now consider the following *parallel corona splitting* of the inner product $\left\langle H(f\sigma),g\right\rangle_{\omega}$ that involves the projections $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}$ acting on f and the projections $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega}$

acting on g. These forms are no longer linear in f and g as the 'cut' is determined by the coronas $\mathcal{C}_F$ and $\mathcal{C}_G$, which depend on f and g. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(0.6)\quad \left\langle H_\sigma f, g\right\rangle_\omega &= \sum_{(F,G)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}} \left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right), \left(\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_G} g\right)\right\rangle_\omega \\
&= \left\{\sum_{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})} + \sum_{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})} + \sum_{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}\right\} \\
&\qquad \times \left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right), \left(\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_G} g\right)\right\rangle_\omega \\
&\equiv \mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g) + \mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g) + \mathsf{H}_{far}(f,g).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ is the set of pairs $(F,G)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}$ such that G is the *minimal* interval in $\mathcal{G}$ that contains F, or F is the *minimal* interval in $\mathcal{F}$ that contains G, more precisely: either

$$F\subset G \text{ and there is no } G_1\in\mathcal{G}\setminus\{G\} \text{ with } F\subset G_1\subset G,$$

or

$$G\subset F \text{ and there is no } F_1\in\mathcal{F}\setminus\{F\} \text{ with } G\subset F_1\subset F.$$

The set $\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ is the set of pairs $(F,G)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}$ such that $F\cap G=\emptyset$. The set $\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ is the complement of $\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\cup\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ in $\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}$:

$$\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}\setminus\left\{\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\cup\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\right\}.$$

The parallel corona splitting (0.6) is somewhat analogous to the splitting (0.5) except that the stopping intervals at the top of the corona blocks are used in place of the individual intervals within the coronas to determine the 'cut'. It is this feature that permits our characterization of the two weight inequality (0.2) in terms of $\mathcal{A}_2$ and indicator/interval testing conditions.

Before moving on, it is convenient to introduce a corona decomposition that uses stopping data more general in scope than the Calderón-Zygmund data.

0.3. General stopping data.

Our general definition of stopping data will use a positive constant $C_0\geq 4$.

Definition 1. *Suppose we are given a positive constant* $C_0\geq 4$*, a subset* $\mathcal{F}$ *of the dyadic grid* $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ *(called the stopping times), and a corresponding sequence* $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}\equiv\{\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ *of nonnegative numbers* $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\geq 0$ *(called the stopping data). Let* $(\mathcal{F},\prec,\pi_{\mathcal{F}})$ *be the tree structure on* $\mathcal{F}$ *inherited from* $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$*, and for each* $F\in\mathcal{F}$ *denote by* $\mathcal{C}_F=\{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma:\pi_{\mathcal{F}}I=F\}$ *the corona associated with* F*:*

$$\mathcal{C}_F=\left\{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma: I\subset F \text{ and } I\not\subset F' \text{ for any } F'\prec F\right\}.$$

We say the triple $(C_0,\mathcal{F},\alpha_{\mathcal{F}})$ *constitutes* stopping data *for a function* $f\in L^1_{loc}(\sigma)$ *if*

1. $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I|f|\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ *for all* $I\in\mathcal{C}_F$ *and* $F\in\mathcal{F}$*,*
2. $\sum_{F'\preceq F}|F'|_\sigma\leq C_0|F|_\sigma$ *for all* $F\in\mathcal{F}$*,*
3. $\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)^2|F|_\sigma\leq C_0^2\|f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}$*,*
4. $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')$ *whenever* $F',F\in\mathcal{F}$ *with* $F'\subset F$*.*

Definition 2. *If* $(C_0,\mathcal{F},\alpha_{\mathcal{F}})$ *constitutes (general)* stopping data *for a function* $f\in L^1_{loc}(\sigma)$*, we refer to the othogonal decomposition*

$$f=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F}f;\qquad \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F}f\equiv\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\triangle^{\sigma}_I f,$$

as the (general) corona decomposition *of* f *associated with the stopping times* $\mathcal{F}$*.*

Property (1) says that $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ bounds the averages of f in the corona $\mathcal{C}_F$, and property (2) says that the intervals at the tops of the coronas satisfy a Carleson condition relative to the weight σ. Note that a standard 'maximal interval' argument extends the Carleson condition in property (2) to the inequality

$$\sum_{F'\in\mathcal{F}:\ F'\subset A}|F'|_{\sigma}\leq C_0|A|_{\sigma}\text{ for all open sets }A\subset\mathbb{R}.$$

Property (3) says the sequence of functions $\{\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\mathbf{1}_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ is in the vector-valued space $L^2\left(\ell^2;\sigma\right)$, and property (4) says that the control on averages is nondecreasing on the stopping tree $\mathcal{F}$. We emphasize that we are *not* assuming in this definition the stronger property that there is $C>1$ such that $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')>C\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ whenever $F',F\in\mathcal{F}$ with $F'\subsetneqq F$. Instead, the properties (2) and (3) substitute for this lack. Of course the stronger property *does* hold for the familiar *Calderón-Zygmund* stopping data determined by the following requirements for $C>1$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{F'}|f| & > & C\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F|f|\text{ whenever }F',F\in\mathcal{F}\text{ with }F'\subsetneqq F,\\ \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_I|f| & \leq & C\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F|f|\text{ for }I\in\mathcal{C}_F,\end{array}$$

which are themselves sufficiently strong to automatically force properties (2) and (3) with $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)=\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F|f|$.

We have the following useful consequence of (2) and (3) that says the sequence $\{\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\mathbf{1}_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ has a *quasiorthogonal* property relative to f with a constant C_0' depending only on C_0:

$$\left\|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\mathbf{1}_F\right\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}\leq C_0'\|f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}.\tag{0.7}$$

Indeed, the Carleson condition (2) implies a geometric decay in levels of the tree $\mathcal{F}$, namely that there are positive constants C_1 and ε, depending on C_0, such that if $\mathfrak{C}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ denotes the set of n^{th} generation children of F in $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{F}}(F):}|F'|_{\sigma}\leq\left(C_1 2^{-\varepsilon n}\right)^2|F|_{\sigma},\qquad\text{for all }n\geq 0\text{ and }F\in\mathcal{F}.$$

From this we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{F}}(F):}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')|F'|_{\sigma} &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sqrt{\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{F}}(F)}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')^2|F'|_{\sigma}}C_1 2^{-\varepsilon n}\sqrt{|F|_{\sigma}}\\ &\leq C_1\sqrt{|F|_{\sigma}}C_{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}2^{-\varepsilon n}\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{F}}(F)}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')^2|F'|_{\sigma}},\end{aligned}$$

and hence that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\left\{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(n)}(F)}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')\left|F'\right|_{\sigma}\right\}\\
\lesssim\ &\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\sqrt{\left|F\right|_{\sigma}}\sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}2^{-\varepsilon n}\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(n)}(F)}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')^{2}\left|F'\right|_{\sigma}}\\
\lesssim\ &\left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)^{2}\left|F\right|_{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}2^{-\varepsilon n}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(n)}(F)}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')^{2}\left|F'\right|_{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
\lesssim\ &\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left(\sum_{F'\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')^{2}\left|F'\right|_{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}^{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (0.7) since $\left\|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\mathbf{1}_{F}\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}^{2}$ is dominated by twice the left hand side above.

Here is a basic reduction involving the NTV constant $\mathfrak{NTV}$.

Proposition 1. *Let*

$$\left\langle H_{\sigma}(f),g\right\rangle_{\omega}=\mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g)+\mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g)+\mathsf{H}_{far}(f,g)$$

be a parallel corona decomposition as in (0.6) of the bilinear form $\left\langle H(f\sigma),g\right\rangle_{\omega}$ with stopping data $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ for f and g respectively. Then we have

$$\left|\left\langle H_{\sigma}(f),g\right\rangle_{\omega}-\mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g)\right|\lesssim(\mathfrak{NTV})\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)},$$

for all $f\in L^{2}(\sigma),g\in L^{2}(\omega)$.

We will use Proposition 1 in conjunction with a construction that permits *iteration* of general corona decompositions.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $(C_0,\mathcal{F},\alpha_{\mathcal{F}})$ constitutes* stopping data *for a function $f\in L_{loc}^{1}(\sigma)$, and that for each $F\in\mathcal{F}$, $\left(C_0,\mathcal{K}(F),\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}\right)$ constitutes* stopping data *for the corona projection $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}f$. There is a positive constant C_1, depending only on C_0, such that if*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}^{*}(F)&\equiv\left\{K\in\mathcal{K}(F)\cap\mathcal{C}_{F}:\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}(K)\geq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\right\}\\
\mathcal{K}&\equiv\bigcup_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{K}^{*}(F)\cup\{F\},\\
\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)&\equiv\begin{array}{ccc}\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}(K) & \textit{for} & K\in\mathcal{K}^{*}(F)\setminus\{F\}\\ \max\left\{\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F),\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}(F)\right\} & \textit{for} & K=F\end{array},\qquad\textit{for }F\in\mathcal{F},
\end{aligned}$$

the triple $(C_1,\mathcal{K},\alpha_{\mathcal{K}})$ constitutes stopping data *for f. We refer to the collection of intervals $\mathcal{K}$ as the* iterated *stopping times, and to the orthogonal decomposition $f=\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}}P_{\mathcal{C}_{K}^{\mathcal{K}}}f$ as the* iterated *corona decomposition of f, where*

$$\mathcal{C}_{K}^{\mathcal{K}}\equiv\left\{I\in\mathcal{D}:I\subset K\textit{ and }I\not\subset K'\textit{ for }K'\prec_{\mathcal{K}}K\right\}.$$

Note that in our definition of $(C_1,\mathcal{K},\alpha_{\mathcal{K}})$ we have ‘discarded’ from $\mathcal{K}(F)$ all of those $K\in\mathcal{K}(F)$ that are not in the corona $\mathcal{C}_F$, and also all of those $K\in\mathcal{K}(F)$

for which $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}(K)$ is strictly less than $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$. Then the union of over F of what remains is our new collection of stopping times. We then define stopping data $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)$ according to whether or not $K\in\mathcal{F}$: if $K\notin\mathcal{F}$ but $K\in\mathcal{C}_F$ then $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)$ equals $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}(K)$, while if $K\in\mathcal{F}$, then $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)$ is the larger of $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}(F)$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(K)$.

Proof. The monotonicity property (4) for the triple $(C_1,\mathcal{K},\alpha_{\mathcal{K}})$ is obvious from the construction of $\mathcal{K}$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)$. To establish property (1), we must distinguish between the various coronas $\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathcal{K}}$, $\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathcal{K}(F)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathcal{F}}$ that could be associated with $K\in\mathcal{K}$, when K belongs to any of the stopping trees $\mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{K}(F)$ or $\mathcal{F}$. Suppose now that $I\in\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathcal{K}}$ for some $K\in\mathcal{K}$. Then there is a unique $F\in\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathcal{K}}\subset\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathcal{K}(F)}\subset\mathcal{C}_F^{\mathcal{F}}$, and so $\mathbb{E}_I^{\sigma}|f|\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ by property (1) for the triple $(C_0,\mathcal{F},\alpha_{\mathcal{F}})$. Then $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)$ follows from the definition of $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)$, and we have property (1) for the triple $(C_1,\mathcal{K},\alpha_{\mathcal{K}})$. Property (2) holds for the triple $(C_1,\mathcal{K},\alpha_{\mathcal{K}})$ since if $K\in\mathcal{C}_F^{\mathcal{F}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{K'\preceq_{\mathcal{K}}K}|K'|_{\sigma} &= \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}(F):\ K'\subset K}|K'|_{\sigma}+\sum_{F'\prec_{\mathcal{F}}F:\ F'\subset K}\ \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}(F')}|K'|_{\sigma}\\ &\leq C_0^2\,|K|_{\sigma}+\sum_{F'\prec_{\mathcal{F}}F:\ F'\subset K}C_0^2\,|F'|_{\sigma}\leq 2C_0^2\,|K|_{\sigma}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, property (3) holds for the triple $(C_1,\mathcal{K},\alpha_{\mathcal{K}})$ since

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}}\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)^2\,|K|_{\sigma} &= \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(F)}\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(F)}(K)^2\,|K|_{\sigma}\\ &\leq \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}C_0^2\left\|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^{\sigma}f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2\leq C_0^2\,\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2\,.\end{aligned}$$

□

CHAPTER 2

Bounded fluctuation and functional energy

In the proof of Theorem 2 it will be convenient to isolate two intermediate notions that guide the philosophy of the proof, namely minimal bounded fluctuation functions, and the functional energy conditions.

1. Bounded fluctuation

The notion of bounded fluctuation is an extension of the notion of bounded function intermediate between L^∞ and BMO^{dyadic}. There are various versions of bounded fluctuation functions, and conditions defined in terms of them, that arise in the course of our investigation. We start with a definition of bounded fluctuation that is closely tied to the corona projections in the CZ corona decomposition.

Definition 3. *Given $\gamma > 0$, an interval $K \in \mathcal{D}^\sigma$, and a function f supported on K, we say that f is a function of* bounded fluctuation *on K, written $f \in \mathcal{BF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(K)$, if there is a pairwise disjoint collection $\mathcal{K}_f$ of $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$-subintervals of K such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K f\sigma &= 0, \\ f &= a_{K'} \text{ (a constant) on } K', \qquad K' \in \mathcal{K}_f, \\ |a_{K'}| &> \gamma, \qquad K' \in \mathcal{K}_f, \\ \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma} \int_I |f|\,\sigma &\leq 1, \qquad I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}_f}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}_f} = \{I \in \mathcal{D}^\sigma : I \subset K \text{ and } I \not\subset K' \text{ for any } K' \in \mathcal{K}_f\}$$

is the corona determined by K and $\mathcal{K}_f$.

In the case $\gamma > 1$, we see that f is of bounded fluctuation on K if it is supported in K with mean zero, and equals a constant $a_{K'}$ of modulus greater than γ on any subinterval K' where $\mathbb{E}_{K'}^\sigma |f| > 1$. Thus in the case $\gamma > 1$, the collection of distinguished intervals is uniquely determined, but in general $\mathcal{K}_f$ must be specified. If we also require in Definition 3 that

$$a_{K'} > \gamma, \qquad K' \in \mathcal{K}_f,$$

then we denote the resulting collection of functions by $\mathcal{PBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(K)$ and refer to such an f as a function of *positive* bounded fluctuation on K.

Now we observe that for $f \in \mathcal{BF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(K)$ with $\gamma > 1$, the Haar support *supp* $\widehat{f}$ of f contains the set $\pi\mathcal{K}_f$ of parents of the intervals in $\mathcal{K}_f$. Indeed, if $K' \in \mathcal{K}_f$, then the expected values of f on K' and its sibling $\theta K'$ necessarily differ, which implies that $\pi K'$ is in the Haar support of $\widehat{f}$. More precisely, on K' we have

$$\triangle_{\pi K'}^{\sigma} f = a_{K'} - \mathbb{E}_{\pi K'}^{\sigma} f,$$

and since $|\mathbb{E}_{\pi K'}^{\sigma} f| \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi K'}^{\sigma} |f| \leq 1$, we have $|\triangle_{\pi K'}^{\sigma} f| \,|_{K'} \geq |a_{K'}| - 1 \geq \gamma - 1 > 0$. It turns out to be a crucial reduction in our proof of Theorem 2 that we can restrict attention to functions f of bounded fluctuation that have *minimal* Haar support *supp* $\widehat{f}$, namely equal to $\pi \mathcal{K}_f$. More precisely, define $\widehat{f} : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{C}$ by $\widehat{f}(I) \equiv \langle f, h_I^{\sigma} \rangle_{\sigma}$ to be the Haar coefficient map (with underlying measure σ being understood), and

$$\pi \mathcal{K}_f \equiv \{\pi_{\mathcal{D}} K' : K' \in \mathcal{K}_f\}.$$

It will however be necessary to relax the requirement that γ be large, and instead require $K' = (\pi_{\mathcal{D}} K')_{small}$ for $K' \in \mathcal{K}_f$. Here the two dyadic children of I are defined as I_{small} and I_{big} where $|I_{small}|_{\sigma} \leq |I_{big}|_{\sigma}$.

DEFINITION 4. *For $\gamma > 0$, define the collection $\mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(K)$ of functions of* minimal *bounded fluctuation by*

$$\left\{ f \in \mathcal{PBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(K) : supp\ \widehat{f} \subset \pi \mathcal{K}_f \text{ and } K' = (\pi_{\mathcal{D}} K')_{small} \text{ for } K' \in \mathcal{K}_f \right\}.$$

Thus the functions $f \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}(K)$ have their Haar support *supp* $\widehat{f}$ as small as possible given that they satisfy the conditions for belonging to $\mathcal{PBF}_{\sigma}(K)$. Moreover, the distinguished intervals K' in $\mathcal{K}_f$ are the *small* child of their parent - a property that is a consequence of $a_{K'} > \gamma$ if $\gamma \geq 1$, but in general must be included in the definition. Note that while $\mathcal{K}_f$ consists of pairwise disjoint intervals for $f \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}(K)$, the collection of parents $\pi \mathcal{K}_f$ may have considerable overlap, and this represents the main difficulty in dealing with functions of minimal bounded fluctuation. We use the term *restricted bounded fluctuation on K* to designate a function f that is *either* bounded by 1 in modulus on K, *or* is of minimal bounded fluctuation on K; i.e.

$$f \in \mathcal{RBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(K) \equiv (L_K^{\infty})_1(\sigma) \bigcup \mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(K).$$

The final key element in our proof of Theorem 2 is an estimate for a highly nonlinear form $\mathsf{B}_{stop}(f,g)$ with either $f \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}$ or $g \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\omega}$, and a bound on the stopping energy $\boldsymbol{X}(f,g)$, that exploits the interval size splitting of NTV. See Lemma 16.

2. Functional energy

In the proof of Theorem 2 it will be convenient to isolate the following intermediate notion that guides the philosophy of the proof, namely the functional energy conditions.

DEFINITION 5. *A collection $\mathcal{F}$ of dyadic intervals is* σ-Carleson *if*

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}:\ F \subset S} |F|_{\sigma} \leq C_{\mathcal{F}} |S|_{\sigma}, \qquad S \in \mathcal{F}.$$

The constant $C_{\mathcal{F}}$ is referred to as the Carleson norm of $\mathcal{F}$.

DEFINITION 6. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a collection of dyadic intervals. A collection of functions $\{g_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ in $L^2(\omega)$ is said to be* $\mathcal{F}$-adapted *if for each $F\in\mathcal{F}$ there is a collection $\mathcal{J}(F)$ of intervals in $\mathcal{D}^\omega$ such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(F)\subset\{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega : J\Subset F\}$$

($J\Subset F$ implies J is (ϵ,r)-good with respect to $\mathcal{D}^\sigma=\mathcal{D}^\omega$ as in Subsection 3 below) and if $\mathcal{J}^*(F)$ consists of the maximal *intervals J in the collection $\mathcal{J}(F)$, then each of the following three conditions hold:*

1. *for each $F\in\mathcal{F}$, the Haar coefficients $\widehat{g_F}(J)=\langle g_F,h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega$ of g_F are non-negative and supported in $\mathcal{J}(F)$, i.e.*
$$\left\{\begin{array}{lll}\widehat{g_F}(J)\geq 0 & \text{for all} & J\in\mathcal{J}(F)\\ \widehat{g_F}(J)=0 & \text{for all} & J\notin\mathcal{J}(F)\end{array}\right. ,\qquad F\in\mathcal{F},$$
2. *the collection $\{g_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ is pairwise orthogonal in $L^2(\omega)$,*
3. *there is a positive constant C such that for every interval I in $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$, the collection of intervals*
$$\mathcal{B}_I\equiv\{J^*\subset I : J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\ \text{for some}\ F\supset I\}$$
has overlap bounded by C, i.e. $\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{B}_I}\mathbf{1}_{J^*}\leq C$, for all $I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma$.

Note that condition (2) holds if the collections $\mathcal{J}(F)$ are pairwise disjoint for $F\in\mathcal{F}$.

DEFINITION 7. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the smallest constant in the '$\mathfrak{f}$unctional energy' inequality below, holding for all non-negative $h\in L^2(\sigma)$, all σ-Carleson collections $\mathcal{F}$, and all $\mathcal{F}$-adapted collections $\{g_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$, and where $\mathcal{J}^*(F)$ consists of the* maximal *intervals J in the collection $\mathcal{J}(F)$:*

(2.1)

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\mathrm{P}(J^*,h\sigma)\left|\left\langle\frac{x}{|J^*|},g_F\mathbf{1}_{J^*}\right\rangle_\omega\right|\leq\mathfrak{F}\|h\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left[\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\|g_F\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\right]^{1/2}.$$

We refer to this as the *functional energy condition*. There is of course a dual version of this condition as well with constant $\mathfrak{F}^*$.

3. Outline of the proof

The disjoint form $\mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g)$ in (0.6) is easily controlled by the strong $\mathcal{A}_2$ condition and the interval testing conditions using Lemma 2 in Section 3:

$$|\mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g)|\lesssim(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{V})\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}.$$

We show in Section 5 that after further corona decompositions, the near and far forms satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g)| &\lesssim (\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{V}_{ind}+\mathfrak{M}+\mathfrak{M}^*)\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},\\ |\mathsf{H}_{far}(f,g)| &\lesssim (\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{V})\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}^*$ are the best constants in a bilinear minimal bounded fluctuation inequality (4.10) and its dual, and with the bulk of the work in estimating the far form H_{far} taken up in proving the Interwining Proposition in Section 4.

Finally, in Section 6 we use the Intertwining Proposition 2 to reduce the *bi*linear minimal bounded fluctuation condition (4.10) to a similar inequality (1.1), but for a *non*linear form B_{stop} that is esssentially the stopping term introduced by NTV in [**NTV4**], i.e.

$$\mathfrak{M}+\mathfrak{M}^{*}\lesssim\mathfrak{NTV}+\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{minimal}+\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{minimal\ *},$$

where $\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{minimal}$ is the best constant in (1.1). Finally, the full force of the special structure of minimal bounded fluctuation functions is exploited along with energy control, to obtain

$$\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{minimal}+\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{minimal\ *}\lesssim\mathfrak{NTV},$$

and this completes the proof of Theorem 2. Thus the only place where indicator/interval testing is used over interval testing, is in reducing control of the near form H_{near} to the bilinear minimal bounded fluctutation conditions (4.10).

CHAPTER 3

Preliminaries of the proof

A crucial reduction of Problem 0.2 is delivered by the following lemma due to Nazarov, Treil and Volberg (see [**NTV4**] and [**Vol**]).

Lemma 2. *For $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g \in L^2(\omega)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{D}^\omega \\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I|}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\triangle_I^\sigma f\right),\triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| &\lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right)\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{D}^\omega \\ I\cap J=\emptyset \text{ and } \frac{|J|}{|I|}\notin\left[2^{-r},2^r\right]}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\triangle_I^\sigma f\right),\triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} . \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To prove the first assertion we split the sum into two pieces,

$$\left\{ \sum_{\substack{2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I| \\ dist(J,I)\leq 2^{r+1}|I|}} + \sum_{\substack{2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I| \\ dist(J,I)>2^{r+1}|I|}} \right\} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\triangle_I^\sigma f\right),\triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| .$$

The first sum here is handled using the argument for the diagonal short-range terms in Subsection 9.2 of [**LaSaUr**], and the second sum here is handled by the argument for the long-range terms in Subsection 9.4 of [**LaSaUr**].

Now we turn to the second assertion. By duality it suffices to consider only $|J| \leq 2^{-r}|I|$ in the sum on the left of the second assertion, and we split the resulting sum into two pieces:

$$\left\{ \sum_{J\subset 3I\setminus I \text{ and } |J|\leq 2^{-r}|I|} + \sum_{J\cap 3I=\emptyset \text{ and } |J|\leq 2^{-r}|I|} \right\} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\triangle_I^\sigma f\right),\triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| .$$

These sums are estimated using the arguments for the mid-range and long-range terms in Subsections 9.3 and 9.4 respectively of [**LaSaUr**]. □

1. Monotonicity property

The following Monotonicity Property for the Hilbert transform will also play an important role in proving our theorem.

Lemma 3 (Monotonicity Property). *Suppose that ν is a signed measure, and μ is a positive measure with $\mu \geq |\nu|$, both supported outside an interval J. Suppose also that φ is a function supported in J with $\int \varphi d\omega = 0$ and such that there is $c \in J$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(y) &\leq 0 \text{ for } y \leq c, \\ \varphi(y) &\geq 0 \text{ for } y \geq c. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\left|\langle H\nu,\varphi\rangle_{\omega}\right|\leq\langle H\mu,\varphi\rangle_{\omega}.$$

Now let $J\subset J^{*}\subset 2J^{*}\subset I$, and suppose in addition that $\varphi=h_{J}^{\omega}$ and that μ is supported outside I. Then we have the pointwise estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}&\equiv\langle H\mu,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}-\frac{1}{|J^{*}|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^{*},\mu\right)\ \langle x,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\\&=O\left(\frac{|J|}{|J^{*}|^{2}}\widetilde{\mathrm{P}}\left(J^{*},\mu\right)\ \langle x,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathrm{P}}\left(K,\mu\right)&\equiv\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{|K|^{2}}{\left(|K|+|y-c\left(K\right)|\right)^{3}}d\mu\left(y\right),\\\langle x,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}&=\langle x-c\left(J\right),h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}=\int_{J}\left(x-c\left(J\right)\right)h_{J}^{\omega}\left(x\right)d\omega\geq0.\end{aligned}\tag{1.1}$$

Moreover, there is $\gamma>2$ such that if in addition $\gamma J^{*}\subset I$, then

$$\langle H\mu,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\approx\frac{1}{|J^{*}|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^{*},\mu\right)\ \langle x,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}.\tag{1.2}$$

REMARK 2. *This monotonicity property will be applied when $\varphi=h_{J}^{\omega}$ is a Haar function adapted to J, in which case the point c can be taken to be the center of J.*

PROOF. Let $J_{-}=J\cap(-\infty,c)$ and $J_{+}=J\cap(c,\infty)$. We may assume that

$$\int_{J_{-}}|\varphi|\,d\omega=\int_{J_{+}}|\varphi|\,d\omega=1.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle H\nu,\varphi\rangle_{\omega}&=\int_{J_{+}}H\nu\left(x\right)\varphi\left(x\right)d\omega\left(x\right)+\int_{J_{-}}H\nu\left(x\right)\varphi\left(x\right)d\omega\left(x\right)\\&=\int_{J_{+}}H\nu\left(x\right)|\varphi\left(x\right)|\,d\omega\left(x\right)-\int_{J_{-}}H\nu\left(x'\right)|\varphi\left(x'\right)|\,d\omega\left(x'\right)\\&=\int_{J_{+}}\int_{J_{-}}\left[H\nu\left(x\right)-H\nu\left(x'\right)\right]|\varphi\left(x'\right)|\,d\omega\left(x'\right)|\varphi\left(x\right)|\,d\omega\left(x\right)\\&=\int_{J_{+}}\int_{J_{-}}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus J}\frac{x-x'}{\left(y-x\right)\left(y-x'\right)}d\nu\left(y\right)|\varphi\left(x'\right)|\,d\omega\left(x'\right)|\varphi\left(x\right)|\,d\omega\left(x\right),\end{aligned}$$

and since $\frac{x-x'}{(y-x)(y-x')}\geq0$ for $y\in\mathbb{R}\setminus J$ and $x\in J_{+}$ and $x'\in J_{-}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\langle H\nu,\varphi\rangle_{\omega}\right|\\\leq&\int_{J_{+}}\int_{J_{-}}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus J}\frac{x-x'}{\left(y-x\right)\left(y-x'\right)}d\mu\left(y\right)|\varphi\left(x'\right)|\,d\omega\left(x'\right)|\varphi\left(x\right)|\,d\omega\left(x\right)\\=&\langle H\mu,\varphi\rangle_{\omega},\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the previous display with μ in place of ν.

Now suppose that $J \subset J^* \subset 2J^* \subset I$, $\varphi = h_J^\omega$ and μ, ν are supported outside I. Then for $x \in J_+$, $x' \in J_-$ and $y \notin I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{x-x'}{(y-x)(y-x')} - \frac{x-x'}{|J^*|}\frac{|J^*|}{|y-c(J^*)|^2} \\
= \quad & (x-x')\frac{(y-c(J^*))^2-(y-x)(y-x')}{(y-x)(y-x')(y-c(J^*))^2} \\
= \quad & O\left(|x-x'|\frac{|J^*|}{|y-c(J^*)|^3}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we recall that

$$A \equiv \int_{J_-} |h_J^\omega|\, d\omega = \int_{J_+} |h_J^\omega|\, d\omega = \sqrt{\frac{|J_-|_\omega |J_+|_\omega}{|J|_\omega}},$$

so that with $\varphi = \frac{1}{A}h_J^\omega$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle H\mu, h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega = A\ \langle H\mu,\varphi\rangle_\omega \\
= \quad & \frac{1}{A}\int_{J_+}\int_{J_-}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus J}\frac{x-x'}{(y-x)(y-x')}d\mu(y)\,|h_J^\omega(x')|\,d\omega(x')\,|h_J^\omega(x)|\,d\omega(x) \\
= \quad & \frac{1}{A}\int_{J_+}\int_{J_-}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus J}\frac{x-x'}{|J^*|}\frac{|J^*|}{|y-c(J^*)|^2}d\mu(y)\,|h_J^\omega(x')|\,d\omega(x')\,|h_J^\omega(x)|\,d\omega(x) \\
& +O\left(\int_{J_+}\int_{J_-}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus J}|x-x'|\frac{|J^*|}{|y-c(J^*)|^3}d\mu(y)\,|h_J^\omega(x')|\,d\omega(x')\,|h_J^\omega(x)|\,d\omega(x)\right) \\
= \quad & \frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}(J^*,\mu)\ \langle x, h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega + O\left(\frac{|J|}{|J^*|^2}\widetilde{\mathrm{P}}(J^*,\mu)\ \langle x, h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since $|h_J^\omega(x')|\,|h_J^\omega(x)| = -h_J^\omega(x')\,h_J^\omega(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{A}\int_{J_+}\int_{J_-}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus J}\frac{x}{|J^*|}\frac{|J^*|}{|y-c(J^*)|^2}d\mu(y)\,h_J^\omega(x')\,d\omega(x')\,h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x) \\
= \quad & -\frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}(J^*,\mu)\int_{J_+} x h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{A}\int_{J_+}\int_{J_-}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus J}\frac{x'}{|J^*|}\frac{|J^*|}{|y-c(J^*)|^2}d\mu(y)\,|h_J^\omega(x')|\,d\omega(x')\,|h_J^\omega(x)|\,d\omega(x) \\
= \quad & \frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}(J^*,\mu)\int_{J_-} x' h_J^\omega(x')\,d\omega(x'),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{J_+} x h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x) + \int_{J_-} x' h_J^\omega(x')\,d\omega(x') = \langle x, h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega .$$

Finally, (1.2) follows easily from the above pointwise estimate for γ large enough. □

2. Energy lemma

We formulate a refinement of the Energy Lemma from [**LaSaUr**]. First recall that the energy $\mathsf{E}(J,\omega)$ of ω on the interval J is given by

$$\mathsf{E}(J,\omega)^2 \equiv \frac{1}{|J|_\omega}\int_J \left(\mathbb{E}_J^{\omega(dx')}\frac{x-x'}{|J|}\right)^2 d\omega(x),$$

and the corresponding functional $\Phi(J,\nu)$ by

$$\Phi(J,\nu) \equiv \omega(J)\,\mathsf{E}(J,\omega)^2\,\mathrm{P}(J,|\nu|)^2,$$

where ν is a signed measure on $\mathbb{R}$. The following *Energy Condition* was proved in [**LaSaUr**]: for all intervals I,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\Phi(J_n,\nu) \lesssim \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}+\mathfrak{T}\right)|I|_\sigma, \qquad \dot{\bigcup}_{n=1}^{\infty} J_n \subset I. \tag{2.1}$$

Suppose now we are given an interval $J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega$, and a subset $\mathcal{H}$ of the dyadic subgrid $\mathcal{D}^\omega(J)$ of intervals from $\mathcal{D}^\omega$ that are contained in J. Let $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}^\omega = \sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\triangle_{J'}^\omega$ be the ω-Haar projection onto $\mathcal{H}$ and define the $\mathcal{H}$-energy $\mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(J,\omega)$ of ω on the interval J by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(J,\omega)^2 &\equiv \frac{1}{|J|_\omega}\int_J\left(\mathbb{E}_J^{\omega(dx')}\frac{\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}^{\omega(dx)}(x-x')}{|J|}\right)^2 d\omega(x)\\ &= \frac{1}{|J|_\omega}\int_J\left(\frac{\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}^\omega x}{|J|}\right)^2 d\omega(x)\\ &= \frac{1}{|J|_\omega}\sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\left|\left\langle\frac{x}{|J|},h_{J'}^\omega\right\rangle_\omega\right|^2 = \frac{1}{|J|_\omega|J|^2}\sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}|\widehat{x}(J')|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

For ν a signed measure on $\mathbb{R}$, and $\mathcal{H}$ a subset of the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^\omega$, we define the functional

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{H}}(J,\nu) \equiv \omega(J)\,\mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(J,\omega)^2\,\mathrm{P}(J,|\nu|)^2.$$

We need yet another property peculiar to the Hilbert transform kernel

$$K(x,y) = \frac{1}{x-y} = K^x(y) = K_y(x).$$

Lemma 4. *Suppose J is an interval with center c_J, choose $y\notin J$, and let $\eta = \frac{|y-c_J|}{|J|/2} > 1$. Then*

$$\left|\langle K_y,h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega + \frac{\langle x,h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega}{|y-c_J|^2}\right| \le \frac{1}{\eta-1}\frac{\langle x,h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega}{|y-c_J|^2}.$$

Proof. With c_J the center of J, we have using $\int h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x)=0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle K_y,h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega &= \int\frac{1}{x-y}h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x) = \int\frac{1}{(x-c_J)-(y-c_J)}h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x)\\ &= -\frac{1}{y-c_J}\int\frac{1}{1-\frac{x-c_J}{y-c_J}}h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x)\\ &= -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int\frac{(x-c_J)^n}{(y-c_J)^{n+1}}h_J^\omega(x)\,d\omega(x).\end{aligned}$$

Since the Haar function takes opposite signs on its two children we have without loss of generality,

$$\widehat{x}(J)=\int (x-c_J)\,h_J^{\omega}(x)\,d\omega(x)=\int |x-c_J|\,|h_J^{\omega}(x)|\,d\omega(x)\geq 0,$$

and for $n\geq 1$ we then have the estimate

$$\left|\int (x-c_J)^n\,h_J^{\omega}(x)\,d\omega(x)\right|\leq (|J|/2)^{n-1}\int |x-c_J|\,|h_J^{\omega}(x)|\,d\omega(x)=(|J|/2)^{n-1}\,\widehat{x}(J).$$

Consequently,

$$\left|\langle K_y,h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}+\frac{\langle x,h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}}{|y-c_J|^2}\right|\leq\frac{1}{|y-c_J|^2}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}\left(\frac{|J|/2}{y-c_J}\right)^{n-1}\widehat{x}(J)=\frac{1}{(y-c_J)^2}\frac{1}{\eta-1}\widehat{x}(J).$$

□

Thus in the Taylor expansion for the inner product $\langle K_y,h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}$, the linear term dominates.

Lemma 5 (**Energy Lemma**). *Let J be an interval in $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$. Let Ψ_J be an $L^2(\omega)$ function supported in J and with ω-integral zero. Let ν be a signed measure supported in $\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J$ and denote the Haar support of Ψ_J by $\mathcal{H}=supp\widehat{\Psi_J}$. Then we have*

$$|\langle H(\nu),\Psi_J\rangle_{\omega}|\leq C\,\|\Psi_J\|_{L^2(\omega)}\,\Phi_{\mathcal{H}}(J,\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\tag{2.3}$$

The L^2 formulation $|\langle H(\nu),\Psi_J\rangle_{\omega}|\leq C\,\|\Psi_J\|_{L^2(\omega)}\,\Phi(J,\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ proves useful in many estimates. However, we will often apply this in its dual formulation. Namely, we have

$$\|H(\nu)-\mathbb{E}_J^{\omega}H(\nu)\|_{L^2(J,\omega)}\lesssim\Phi(J,\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\tag{2.4}$$

Note that on the left, we are subtracting off the mean value, and only testing the $L^2(\omega)$ norm on J.

Proof. We calculate using Lemma 4 that

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle H(\nu),\Psi_J\rangle_{\omega}| &= \left|\int_J\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J}\frac{1}{x-y}\;\Psi_J(x)\;d\nu(y)\;d\omega(x)\right|\\ &= \left|\int_J\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J}\frac{1}{x-y}\;\sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\langle\Psi_J,h_{J'}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\,h_{J'}^{\omega}(x)\;d\nu(y)\;d\omega(x)\right|\\ &= \left|\sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J}\langle K_y,h_{J'}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\;\;\widehat{\Psi_J}(J')\;\;d\nu(y)\right|\\ &\leq \sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J}\frac{1}{\eta-1}\,\langle x,h_{J'}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\,\frac{1}{|y-c_{J'}|^2}\;\left|\widehat{\Psi_J}(J')\right|\;d|\nu|(y).\end{aligned}$$

Now use the approximation $\frac{1}{|y-c_{J'}|^2} \approx \frac{1}{|y-c_J|^2}$ for $J' \subset J$ and $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus 2J$, so that the sum in J' becomes isolated. Then an application of Cauchy-Schwarz in J' yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\langle H(\nu), \Psi_J \rangle_\omega\right| &\lesssim \frac{1}{\eta-1} \left\|\Psi_J\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \left(\sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \left|\langle x, h^\omega_{J'} \rangle_\omega\right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J} \frac{1}{\left|y-c_J\right|^2} d\left|\nu\right|(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta-1} \left\|\Psi_J\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \left(\sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \left|\widehat{x}\left(J'\right)\right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|J|} \mathrm{P}(J, |\nu|) \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta-1} \left\|\Psi_J\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \Phi_{\mathcal{H}}\left(J, \nu\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

REMARK 3. *In the special case $\Psi_J = h^\omega_J$, we have $\mathcal{H} = \{J\}$ and (2.3) then gives*

$$\left|\langle H\nu, h^\omega_J \rangle_\omega\right| \lesssim \Phi_{\mathcal{H}}\left(J, \nu\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left\langle \frac{x}{|J|}, h^\omega_J \right\rangle_\omega \mathrm{P}\left(J, |\nu|\right). \tag{2.5}$$

We also need the following elementary Poisson estimate from [**Vol**] (see also [**LaSaUr**],'1 which is corrected here).

LEMMA 6. *Suppose that $J \subset I \subset \widehat{I}$ and that* $\operatorname{dist}(J, \partial I) > \frac{1}{2}|J|^\varepsilon |I|^{1-\varepsilon}$. *Then*

$$|J|^{4\varepsilon-2} \mathrm{P}(J, \sigma \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}\setminus I})^2 \lesssim |I|^{4\varepsilon-2} \mathrm{P}(I, \sigma \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}\setminus I})^2. \tag{2.6}$$

PROOF. We have

$$\mathrm{P}\left(J, \sigma\chi_{\widehat{I}\setminus I}\right) \approx \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \frac{1}{|2^k J|} \int_{(2^k J)\cap\left(\widehat{I}\setminus I\right)} d\sigma,$$

and $\left(2^k J\right) \cap \left(\widehat{I} \setminus I\right) \neq \emptyset$ requires

$$dist\left(J, e\left(I\right)\right) \leq \left|2^k J\right| .$$

Let k_0 be the smallest such k. By our distance assumption we must then have

$$\left|J\right|^\varepsilon \left|I\right|^{1-\varepsilon} \leq dist\left(J, e\left(I\right)\right) \leq 2^{k_0} \left|J\right| ,$$

or

$$2^{-k_0} \leq \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|} \right)^{1-\varepsilon} .$$

Now let k_1 be defined by $2^{k_1} \equiv \frac{|I|}{|J|}$. Then assuming $k_1 > k_0$ (the case $k_1 \leq k_0$ is similar) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}\left(J, \sigma\chi_{\widehat{I}\setminus I}\right) &\approx \left\{ \sum_{k=k_0}^{k_1} + \sum_{k=k_1}^{\infty} \right\} 2^{-k} \frac{1}{|2^k J|} \int_{(2^k J)\cap\left(\widehat{I}\setminus I\right)} d\sigma \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k_0} \frac{|I|}{|2^{k_0} J|} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_{(2^{k_1} J)\cap\left(\widehat{I}\setminus I\right)} d\sigma \right) + 2^{-k_1} \mathrm{P}\left(I, \sigma\chi_{\widehat{I}\setminus I}\right) \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|} \right)^{1-2\varepsilon} \mathrm{P}\left(I, \sigma\chi_{\widehat{I}\setminus I}\right) + \frac{|J|}{|I|} \mathrm{P}\left(I, \sigma\chi_{\widehat{I}\setminus I}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which is the inequality (2.6). □

Finally, we need the following variant of Lemma 2 where we replace the Haar function in the inner product $\langle H_\sigma(\triangle_I^\sigma f), \triangle_J^\omega g\rangle$ (appearing in the statement of Lemma 2) corresponding to the larger interval by a bounded function dominated by an expectation, provided the larger interval is a stopping interval.

LEMMA 7. *Suppose that all of the interval pairs $(I,J) \in \mathcal{D}^\sigma \times \mathcal{D}^\omega$ considered below are good. Suppose that $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g \in L^2(\omega)$ and that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are σ-Carleson and ω-Carleson collections respectively as in Definition 5. Furthermore, suppose that for each pair of intervals $I \in \mathcal{D}^\sigma$ and $J \in \mathcal{D}^\omega$, there are bounded functions $\beta_{I,J}$ and $\gamma_{I,J}$ supported in $I \setminus 2J$ and $J \setminus 2I$ respectively, satisfying*

$$\left\|\beta_{I,J}\right\|_\infty, \left\|\gamma_{I,J}\right\|_\infty \le 1.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^\omega\\ I\cap J=\emptyset \text{ and } |J|\le 2^{-r}|I|}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_I\mathbb{E}_I^\sigma f\right), \triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{G}\\ I\cap J=\emptyset \text{ and } |I|\le 2^{-r}|J|}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\triangle_I^\sigma f\right), \gamma_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_J\mathbb{E}_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \\ \lesssim\ & \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^\omega\\ 2^{-r}|I|\le|J|\le|I|}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathbf{1}_I\mathbb{E}_I^\sigma f\right), \triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| + \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{G}\\ 2^{-r}|J|\le|I|\le|J|}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\triangle_I^\sigma f\right), \mathbf{1}_J\mathbb{E}_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \\ &\lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. (of Lemma 7) The proof of Lemma 7 follows the lines of the proof of Lemma 2, but using the 'almost orthogonality' property $\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}|F|_\sigma\left(\mathbb{E}_I^\sigma|f|\right)^2 \lesssim \left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2$ in place of the orthonormality of the Haar system $\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\langle f, h_I^\sigma\rangle_\sigma\right|^2 = \left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2$ - and similarly for $\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2$.We prove only the case $(I,J) \in \mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^\omega$ and $|I| \ge 2^r|J|$.

We split the first sum in (2.7) into two sums, namely a long-range sum where in addition $J \cap 3I = \emptyset$, and a mid-range sum where in addition $J \subset 3I \setminus I$. We begin with the proof for the long-range sum, namely we prove

$$\begin{aligned} A_{long-range} &\equiv \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^\omega\\ 3I\cap J=\emptyset \text{ and } |J|\le 2^{-r}|I|}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_I\mathbb{E}_I^\sigma f\right), \triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

We apply the Energy Lemma 5 to estimate the inner product $\left\langle H_\sigma(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_I), h_J^\omega\right\rangle_\omega$ using $\nu = \beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_I\sigma$ and $2J \cap supp\left(\beta_{I,J}\right) = \emptyset$. Since $|\nu| \le \left\|\beta_{I,J}\right\|_\infty\mathbf{1}_I\sigma \le \mathbf{1}_I\sigma$, the Energy Lemma applies to give us the estimate below.

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(I,J) &\equiv \left|\left\langle H_\sigma(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_I), h_J^\omega\right\rangle_\omega\right| \lesssim \sqrt{|J|_\omega}\mathrm{P}(J,|\nu|) \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{|J|_\omega}\mathrm{P}(J,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma) \lesssim \sqrt{|J|_\omega}\,|I|_\sigma\cdot\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We have used the inequality $\mathrm{P}(J,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma)\lesssim\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\left|I\right|_\sigma$, trivially valid when $3I\cap J=\emptyset$ and $|J|\leq|I|$. We may assume that $\|f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}=\|g\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}=1$. We then estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{long-range} &\leq \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J\,:\,|J|\leq|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I f\right|\beta(I,J)\left|\langle g,h^\omega_J\rangle_\omega\right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J\,:\,|J|\leq|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I f\right|\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma}\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\sqrt{\left|J\right|_\omega}\left|\langle g,h^\omega_J\rangle_\omega\right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I f\right|^2\left|I\right|_\sigma\sum_{J\,:\,|J|\leq|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^\delta\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\sqrt{\left|J\right|_\omega} \\
&\quad+\sum_J\left|\langle g,h^\omega_J\rangle_\omega\right|^2\sum_{I\,:\,|J|\leq|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{-\delta}\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\sqrt{\left|J\right|_\omega},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have inserted the gain and loss factors $\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{\pm\delta}$ with $0<\delta<1$ to facilitate application of Schur's test. For each fixed $I\in\mathcal{F}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{J\,:\,|J|\leq|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^\delta\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\sqrt{\left|J\right|_\omega} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma}\sum_{k=0}^\infty 2^{-k\delta}\left(\sum_{J\,:\,2^k|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\left|J\right|_\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad\times\left(\sum_{J\,:\,2^k|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by

$$C\sum_{k=0}^\infty 2^{-k\delta}\left(\frac{\left|I\right|_\sigma}{|I|}\mathrm{P}\left(I,\omega\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2},$$

if $\delta>0$. For each fixed J we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{I\,:\,|J|\leq|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{-\delta}\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^2}\sqrt{\left|J\right|_\omega} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\left|J\right|_\omega}\sum_{k=0}^\infty 2^{-k(1-\delta)}\sum_{I\,:\,2^k|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\frac{|I|}{dist(I,J)^2}\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\left|J\right|_\omega}\sum_{k=0}^\infty 2^{-k(1-\delta)}\left(\sum_{I\,:\,2^k|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\frac{|I|}{dist(I,J)^2}\left|I\right|_\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad\times\left(\sum_{I\,:\,2^k|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\frac{|I|}{dist(I,J)^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\left|J\right|_{\omega}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k(1-\delta)}\mathrm{P}\left(2^{k}J,\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\left|2^{k}J\right|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
\lesssim\ &\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k(1-\delta)}\left(\frac{\left|2^{k}J\right|_{\omega}}{\left|2^{k}J\right|}\mathrm{P}\left(2^{k}J,\sigma\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

if $\delta<1$. With any fixed $0<\delta<1$ we obtain from the inequalities above that

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{long-range} &\lesssim \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}f\right|^{2}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}}+\sum_{J}\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}}\\
&\lesssim \left(\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}^{2}+\left\|\phi\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}^{2}\right)\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}}=2\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

since we assumed $\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}=\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}=1$, and this completes the proof of (2.8).

Now we turn to the proof for the mid-range sum, namely we prove

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{mid-range} &\equiv \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^{\omega}\\ J\subset 3I\setminus I\text{ and }|J|\leq 2^{-r}|I|}}\left|\left\langle H_{\sigma}\left(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}f\right),\triangle_{J}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|\\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.9}$$

To see (2.9), we set for integers $s\geq r$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&A_{mid-range}(s)\equiv\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J\,:\,2^{s}|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset}\left|\left(\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}\left|f\right|\right)\left\langle H_{\sigma}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|\\
&\lesssim\left[\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}\left|f\right|\right)^{2}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\qquad\times\left[\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\sum_{J\,:\,2^{s}|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left|\left\langle H_{\sigma}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|\right)^{2}\right]^{1/2}\\
&\lesssim\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left[2^{s}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J\,:\,2^{s}|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}^{-1}\left|\left\langle H_{\sigma}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}\right]^{1/2}\\
&\lesssim\Lambda(s)\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(s)^{2} &\equiv 2^{s}\sup_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sup_{J\,:\,2^{s}|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}^{-1}\left|\left\langle H_{\sigma}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}\\
&\leq 2^{s}\sup_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J\,:\,2^{s}|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}^{-1}\left|\left\langle H_{\sigma}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2},
\end{aligned}$$

since

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J\,:\,2^{s}|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset}\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}\leq 2\sum_{J}\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}=2\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}^{2}.$$

Due to the ‘local’ nature of the sum in J, we have thus gained a small improvement in the Schur test to derive the last line.

But (2.3) applies since $2J$ is disjoint from the support of $\beta_{I,J}$, J is good with respect to the grid $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$, and so (2.6) also applies to yield

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(s)^2 &\lesssim \sup_{I\in\mathcal{F}} 2^s \sum_{J\,:\,2^s|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset} \frac{\omega(J)}{\sigma(I)}\cdot \mathrm{P}(J,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma)^2 \\ &\lesssim \sup_{I\in\mathcal{F}} 2^s \sum_{J\,:\,2^s|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset} \frac{\omega(J)}{\sigma(I)}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{2-4\varepsilon}\cdot \mathrm{P}(I,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma)^2 \\ &\lesssim \sup_{I\in\mathcal{F}} 2^s 2^{-s(2-4\varepsilon)}\frac{\sigma(I)}{|I|^2} \sum_{J\,:\,2^s|J|=|I|:dist(I,J)\leq|I|\,,\ I\cap J=\emptyset} \omega(J) \\ &\lesssim 2^{-(1-4\varepsilon)s}\mathcal{A}_2\,.\end{aligned}$$

This is clearly a summable estimate in $s\geq r$, so the proof of (2.9) is complete. $\square$

3. The good-bad decomposition

Here we use the random grid idea of Nazarov, Treil and Volberg (see e.g. Chapter 17 of [**Vol**]) as more recently refined in Hytönen, Pérez, Treil and Volberg [**HyPeTrVo**]. For any $\beta=\{\beta_l\}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, define the dyadic grid $\mathbb{D}_\beta$ to be the collection of intervals

$$\mathbb{D}_\beta=\left\{2^n\left([0,1)+k+\sum_{i<n}2^{i-n}\beta_i\right)\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z},\,k\in\mathbb{Z}}$$

This parametrization of dyadic grids appears explicitly in [**Hyt**], and implicitly in [**NTV2**] section 9.1. Place the usual uniform probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, explicitly

$$\mathbb{P}(\beta:\beta_l=0)=\mathbb{P}(\beta:\beta_l=1)=\frac{1}{2},\qquad \text{for all } l\in\mathbb{Z},$$

and then extend by independence of the β_l. Note that the *endpoints* and *centers* of the intervals in the grid $\mathbb{D}_\beta$ are contained in $\mathbb{Q}^{dy}+x_\beta$, the dyadic rationals $\mathbb{Q}^{dy}\equiv\left\{\frac{m}{2^n}\right\}_{m,n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ translated by $x_\beta\equiv\sum_{i<0}2^i\beta_i\in[0,1]$. Moreover the pushforward of the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ under the map $\beta\to x_\beta$ is Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]$. The locally finite weights ω,σ have at most countably many point masses, and it follows with probability one that ω,σ do *not* charge an endpoint or center of any interval in $\mathbb{D}_\beta$.

For a weight ω, we consider a random choice of dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ on the probability space Σ^{ω}, and likewise for second weight σ, with a random choice of dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ on the probability space Σ^{σ}.

NOTATION 1. *We fix $\varepsilon>0$ for use throughout the remainder of the paper.*

DEFINITION 8. *For a positive integer r, an interval $J\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ is said to be* r-bad *if there is an interval $I\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ with $|I|\geq 2^r|I|$, and*

$$\mathrm{dist}(e(I),J)\leq\tfrac{1}{2}|J|^{\varepsilon}|I|^{1-\varepsilon}\,.$$

Here, $e(J)$ is the set of three points consisting of the two endpoints of J and its center. (This is the set of discontinuities of h^{σ}_{J}.) Otherwise, J is said to be r-good. *We symmetrically define $J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ to be* r-good.

Let $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ be randomly selected, with parameter β, and $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ with parameter β'. Define a projection

$$\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{good} f \equiv \sum_{I \text{ is } r\text{-good } \in \mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} \Delta^{\sigma}_{I} f\,, \tag{3.1}$$

and likewise for $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{good} g$. Define an r, ε-good *subgrid* $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}_{good}$ by

$$\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}_{good} = \left\{ I \in \mathcal{D}^{\sigma} : dist\left(I, e\left(\widehat{I}\right)\right) \geq |I|^{\varepsilon} \left|\widehat{I}\right|^{1-\varepsilon} \text{ whenever } \left|\widehat{I}\right| \geq 2^{r} |I| \right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Now define an r, ε-good projection $\mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}}$ on $L^{2}(\sigma)$ by

$$\mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}^{\sigma}_{good}} \langle f, h^{\sigma}_{I} \rangle_{\sigma} h^{\sigma}_{I}, \qquad f \in L^{2}(\sigma)\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Let $T : L^{2}(\sigma) \to L^{2}(\omega)$ be a bounded linear operator. Then the operator norm $\|T\|_{L^{2}(\sigma) \longrightarrow L^{2}(\omega)}$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta} \mathbb{E}_{\beta'} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)} = \|g\|_{L^{2}(\omega)} = 1} \left| \left\langle T \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{good} \mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} f, \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{good} \mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} g \right\rangle_{\omega} \right|,$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\beta}, \mathbb{E}_{\beta'}$ are the expectations relative to the probability space of grids, the projections $\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{good}$ and $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{good}$ are defined in (3.1), and the projections $\mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}}$ and $\mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}$ are defined in (3.3). The constant $\varepsilon > 0$ in these definitions is taken sufficiently small, and the associated constant $r > 0$ is then taken sufficiently large depending on ε.

SUMMARY 1. *It suffices to consider only r-good intervals, and only functions of the form $f = G_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} f$ and $g = G_{\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} g$, and prove an estimate for $\|H(\sigma\cdot)\|_{L^{2}(\sigma) \to L^{2}(\omega)}$ that is independent of these assumptions. Accordingly, we will call r-good intervals just* good intervals *from now on, and we will assume $f = \mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}} f$ and $g = \mathsf{G}_{\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} g$. It is important to note that an interval $J \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega}_{good}$ satisfies the 'good' inequality (3.2) with respect to* both *grids $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$. In fact, we will assume that the two grids $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ actually coincide. For this see Hytönen, Pérez, Treil and Volberg* [**HyPeTrVo**].

REMARK 4. *If $J \subset I$ is an r, ε-good subinterval of an interval I, then one of the following two cases holds:*
Case (1): *either $|J| > 2^{-r} |I|$,*
Case (2): *or $|J| \leq 2^{-r} |I|$ and $dist\,(J, e\,(I)) \geq |J|^{\varepsilon} |I|^{1-\varepsilon}$.*
For a fixed interval I, there are only 2^{r+1} intervals J in Case (1), and since the lengths of $|J|$ and $|I|$ are comparable, all of the estimates we claim in this paper for Case (1) subintervals J turn out to be essentially trivial. Thus the Case (2) subintervals J constitute the substantial case, and for these subintervals we write $J \Subset I$ and refer to J as simply a good *subinterval of I.*

CHAPTER 4

Intertwining proposition and functional energy

Our main result here says that, modulo terms that are controlled by the $\mathcal{A}_2$ and interval testing conditions, we can in two special situations, pass the ω-corona projection $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}$ through the Hilbert transform H to become the σ-corona projection $\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}$. More precisely, we mean that with $H_{\sigma}f \equiv H(f\sigma)$, the intertwining operator

$$\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}\left[\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}H_{\sigma}-H_{\sigma}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}\right]\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}}$$

is bounded with constant $\mathcal{NTV}$. The first special situation in which this works is when $G\subset F$ and $(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$, in which case the intertwining operator reduces to $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}H_{\sigma}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_{F}}$ since $\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}=\emptyset$.

The case when $(F,G)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ is more problematic, and we do not know if the analogous result holds for it. However, we *can* pass the ω-corona projection $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}$ through a restricted portion of the sum, which we now describe. For a fixed $F\in\mathcal{F}$, it will be convenient to write $G\sim F$ to mean that G satisfies the properties $(F,G)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ and $G\subset F$, so that we can iterate the near sum as

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\left\{\sum_{(I,J)\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}\times\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}\left\langle H_{\sigma}\bigtriangleup^{\sigma}_{I}f,\bigtriangleup^{\omega}_{J}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right\}\\ &\qquad=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{G\sim F}\left\{\sum_{(I,J)\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}\times\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}\left\langle H_{\sigma}\bigtriangleup^{\sigma}_{I}f,\bigtriangleup^{\omega}_{J}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The additional restriction we impose on the inner sum above is that I is contained in a $\mathcal{G}$-child G' of G; thus while $G\subset F$, there is a sort of 'reverse' inclusion required of I. We will establish an intertwining inequality for the 'mixed' form,

$$\mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g)\equiv\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{G\sim F}\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}\times\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}\\ I\Subset G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)}}\left\langle\bigtriangleup^{\sigma}_{I}f,H_{\omega}\bigtriangleup^{\omega}_{J}g\right\rangle_{\sigma}.\tag{0.4}$$

We separate one of the main steps in the proof in the second subsection below, where we show in the Functional Energy Proposition 4 that the functional energy conditions are controlled by the $\mathcal{A}_2$ and interval testing conditions. We will freely apply the Intertwining Proposition 2 in the more complicated analysis of bounded fluctuation in later sections.

1. Intertwining proposition

PROPOSITION 2. *Let* $f=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}^\sigma f$ *and* $g=\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G^\omega}^\omega g$ *be a parallel Calderón-Zygmund corona decomposition for* $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ *and* $g\in L^2(\omega)$*. Then*
(1.1)

$$\left|\sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\left\langle H_\sigma\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}^\sigma f,\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G^\omega}^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right|+\left|\mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g)\right|\lesssim(\mathfrak{NTV})\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}.$$

There is of course a dual formulation with $F\subset G$*.*

We will also need the following generalization of the Intertwining Proposition to parallel corona decompositions that use general stopping data as defined in Definition 1.

PROPOSITION 3. *Let*

$$\left\langle H_\sigma(f),g\right\rangle_\omega=\mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g)+\mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g)+\mathsf{H}_{far}(f,g)$$

be a parallel corona decomposition as in (0.6) of the bilinear form $\left\langle H_\sigma f,g\right\rangle_\omega$ *with stopping data* $\mathcal{F}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *for* f *and* g *respectively. Then (1.1) holds.*

In this first subsection we prove that the left hand side of (1.1) is dominated by the larger expression

$$(\mathfrak{NTV}+\mathfrak{F}+\mathfrak{F}^*)\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},\tag{1.2}$$

that includes the functional energy constants $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^*$. In the next subsection we show that the functional energy constants $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^*$ are themselves controlled by $\mathfrak{NTV}$. Finally, in the third subsection we prove the more general Proposition 3.

REMARK 5. *We do not know if the following intertwining inequality holds:*

$$\left|\sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\left\langle H_\sigma\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma\setminus\mathcal{C}_G^\omega}^\sigma f,\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G^\omega}^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\right|\lesssim(\mathfrak{NTV})\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}\ .$$

If true, we could use the techniques of this paper to replace the indicator/interval testing conditions (0.4) with (0.3) and the following weaker inequality and its dual: $\left|\left\langle H_\sigma\mathbf{1}_E,\mathbf{1}_{E'}\right\rangle_\omega\right|\lesssim\sqrt{\left|I\right|_\sigma\left|E'\right|_\omega}$ *for all intervals* I *and compact subsets* $E,E'\subset I$*.*

PROOF. We prove the inequality (1.1) with (1.2) on the right side. We begin by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{H}_{far\ lower}(f,g) &= \sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\left\langle H_\sigma\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}^\sigma f,\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G^\omega}^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\\ &= \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega}\sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ J\in\mathcal{C}_G\text{ and }G\subset F}}\left\langle H_\sigma\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f,\triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega\ ,\end{aligned}$$

and claim the estimate

$$\left|\mathsf{H}_{far\ lower}(f,g)\right|\lesssim(\mathfrak{NTV}+\mathfrak{F})\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}.\tag{1.3}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{H}_{far\ lower}(f,g) &= \sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\int H_\sigma\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F}f\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_G}g\right)\omega\\ &= \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\int H_\sigma\left(\sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ (F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F}f\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_G}g\right)\omega\\ &\equiv \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\int H_\sigma\left(\widehat{f}_G\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_G}g\right)\omega,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{f}_G\equiv\sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ (F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F}f=\sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ (F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\triangle^\sigma_I f,\qquad G\in\mathcal{G}.$$

Now we decompose this last sum according to whether or not the interval I is disjoint from G:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{f}_G &= f^\natural_G+f^\flat_G;\\ f^\natural_G &= \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ (F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F:\ G\subset I}\triangle^\sigma_I f,\\ f^\flat_G &= \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ (F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F:\ G\cap I=\emptyset}\triangle^\sigma_I f.\end{aligned}$$

Once again we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\int H_\sigma\left(f^\flat_G\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_G}g\right)\omega\right| &= \left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ (F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{C}_F\\ I\cap G=\emptyset}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}_G}\int H_\sigma\left(\triangle^\sigma_I f\right)\ \left(\triangle^\omega_J g\right)\omega\right|\\ &\leq \sum_{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{D}^\omega:\ I\cap J=\emptyset}\left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\triangle^\sigma_I f\right),\triangle^\omega_J g\right\rangle_\omega\right|\\ &\lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right)\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2 since the intervals I and J paired above are disjoint.

Turning to the term involving $f^\natural_G$, we note that the intervals I occurring there are linearly and consecutively ordered by inclusion, along with the intervals $F\in\mathcal{F}$ that contain G. More precisely, we can write

$$G\subset F_1(G)\subsetneqq F_2(G)\subsetneqq\ldots F_n(G)\subsetneqq F_{n+1}(G)\subsetneqq\ldots F_N(G)$$

where $F_1(G)$ is the smallest interval in $\mathcal{F}$ containing G and $F_{n+1}(G)=\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F_n(G)$ for all $n\geq1$. Note that the only intervals $F_n(G)$ occurring among the intervals I in the sum for $f^\natural_G$ are those with $n\geq2$, since we must have $(F_n(G),G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$, which requires that there is $F'\in\mathcal{F}$ satisfying $G\subset F'\subsetneqq F_n(G)$. We can also write

$$G\subset I_1(G)\subsetneqq I_2(G)\subsetneqq\ldots I_k(G)\subsetneqq I_{k+1}(G)\subsetneqq\ldots I_K(G)=F_N(G)$$

where $I_1(G)$ is the smallest interval in $\mathcal{C}_{F_2(G)}$ containing G, equivalently $I_1(G) = \pi_{\mathcal{D}^\sigma} F_1(G)$, and $I_{k+1}(G) = \pi_{\mathcal{D}^\sigma} I_k(G)$ for all $k \geq 1$. There is a (unique) subsequence $\{k_n\}_{n=1}^N$ such that

$$F_n(G) = I_{k_n}(G), \qquad 1 \leq n \leq N,$$

upon defining $I_{k_1}(G) = I_0(G) = F_1(G)$. Note here that the only intervals $I_k(G)$ occurring among the intervals I in the sum for $f_G^\natural$ are those with $k > k_1$.

Assume now that $k_n \leq k < k_{n+1}$ and

$$\theta(I_k(G)) = I_{k+1}(G) \setminus I_k(G) \in \mathcal{C}_{F_{n+1}}. \tag{1.4}$$

Then using a telescoping sum, we compute that for $x \in \theta(I_k(G))$,

$$\left| f_G^\natural(x) \right| = \left| \sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \triangle_{I_\ell}^\sigma f(x) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{\theta(I_k(G))}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_{I_K}^\sigma f \right| \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{I_{k_{n+1}}}^\sigma |f| = \mathbb{E}_{F_{n+1}}^\sigma |f|. \tag{1.5}$$

If $k_n \leq k < k_{n+1}$ and (1.4) fails, then we have

$$\theta(I_k(G)) \in \mathfrak{C}(F_{n+1}) \subset \mathcal{F}.$$

Thus we decompose $f_G^\natural(x)$ as (recall $I_{k_1}(G) = F_1(G)$)

$$f_G^\natural = f_{G,local}^\natural + f_{G,corona}^\natural + f_{G,stopping}^\natural ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_{G,local}^\natural &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{F_1(G)}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_{I_K}^\sigma f \right) \mathbf{1}_{F_1(G)} , \\ f_{G,corona}^\natural &= \sum_{k \geq k_1 :\ \theta(I_k(G)) \notin \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\theta(I_k(G))}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_{I_K}^\sigma f \right) \mathbf{1}_{\theta(I_k(G))} , \\ f_{G,stopping}^\natural &= \sum_{k \geq k_1 :\ \theta(I_k(G)) \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\theta(I_k(G))}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_{I_K}^\sigma f \right) \mathbf{1}_{\theta(I_k(G))} . \end{aligned}$$

Now $f_{G,local}^\natural$ depends only on $F_1(G)$, and $\left| f_{G,local}^\natural \right| \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}_{F_1(G)}^\sigma |f| \right) \mathbf{1}_{F_1(G)}$, so that if we write

$$\begin{aligned} f_{F_1(G)}^{@} &\equiv f_{G,local}^\natural, \\ \mathsf{R}_F^\omega g &\equiv \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G} :\ F_1(G) = F} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^\omega g, \end{aligned}$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \int H_\sigma \left(f_{G,local}^\natural \right) \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^\omega g \right) \omega \right| &= \left| \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \int H_\sigma \left(f_F^{@} \right) \left(\mathsf{R}_F^\omega g \right) \omega \right| \\ &\lesssim \mathfrak{T} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f| \right) \sqrt{|F|_\sigma} \left\| \mathsf{R}_F^\omega g \right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \mathfrak{T} \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f| \right)^2 |F|_\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \mathsf{R}_F^\omega g \right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \mathfrak{T} \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} . \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

Next we turn to estimating $f_{G,stopping}^{\natural}$ in the decomposition of $f_G^{\natural}$, which can be controlled by the $\mathcal{A}_2$ condition alone. We claim

$$\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,stopping}^{\natural}\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega}g\right)\omega\right|\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}. \tag{1.7}$$

To prove this we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,stopping}^{\natural}\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega}g\right)\omega\right| \qquad (1.8)\\
&=\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ G\subset\theta(F)}\left(\mathbb{E}_F^{\sigma}f\right)\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathbf{1}_F\right),\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_\omega\right|\\
&=\left|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}_F^{\sigma}f\right)\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathbf{1}_F\right),\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}:\ G\subset\text{some }F'\subset\theta(F)}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_\omega\right|\\
&\leq\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}_F^{\sigma}f\right)\sum_{J\subset\theta(F)}\left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathbf{1}_F\right),\triangle_J^{\omega}g\right\rangle_\omega\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7 applies to the final line above to give (1.7). We remark that using $J\subset\theta(F)$ in the final sum, we can replace $\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}$ with the classical constant $\sqrt{A_2}$ in the estimate above.

To handle $f_{G,corona}^{\natural}$ we will use Lemma 3 and the functional energy condition (2.1) above in conjunction with the representation

$$f_{G,corona}^{\natural}=\sum_{k\geq k_1:\ \theta(I_k(G))\notin\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\theta(I_k(G))}^{\sigma}f-\mathbb{E}_{I_K}^{\sigma}f\right)\mathbf{1}_{\theta(I_k(G))}=\sum_{n=1}^{N}\beta_{F_{n+1},G}\mathbf{1}_{F_{n+1}},$$

where the function $\beta_{F_{n+1},G}$ defined by

$$\beta_{F_{n+1},G}\equiv\sum_{k_n\leq k<k_{n+1}:\ \theta(I_k(G))\notin\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\theta(I_k(G))}^{\sigma}f-\mathbb{E}_{I_K}^{\sigma}f\right)\mathbf{1}_{\theta(I_k(G))},$$

has support in $F_{n+1}\setminus F_n$. Moreover, $\beta_{F_{n+1},G}$ satisfies the following pointwise estimate by (1.5):

$$\left|\beta_{F_{n+1},G}(x)\right|\leq\left(\mathbb{E}_{F_{n+1}}^{\sigma}\left|f\right|\right)\mathbf{1}_{F_{n+1}\setminus F_n}(x). \tag{1.9}$$

Thus with $G(J)=G$ for $J\in\mathcal{C}_G$, we can write

$$\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,corona}^{\natural}\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega}g\right)\omega=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega}\int H_\sigma\left(f_{G(J),corona}^{\natural}\right)\ \left(\triangle_J^{\omega}g\right)\omega,$$

and then by the Monotonicity Lemma 3 and the bound (1.9) we have

$$\left|\widehat{H_\sigma f_{G(J),corona}^{\natural}}(J)\right|\leq\sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ G(J)\subset F\\ (F,G(J))\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}}\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F}^{\sigma}\left|f\right|\right)\mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F}\right),h_J^{\omega}\right\rangle_\omega.$$

Given $J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega$ and $F\in\mathcal{F}$ with $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}J\subset F$, let J^* denote the *maximal* good $\mathcal{D}^\omega$-dyadic interval satisfying $J\subset J^*\subset F$ as in Definition 7. Apply the pointwise estimate in the Monotonicity Lemma 3 and write

$$\widetilde{g}=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}\left|\langle g,h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|h_J^{\omega}.$$

With $\mathcal{J}(K)$ and $\mathcal{J}^*(K)$ as in Definitions 6 and 7, we now obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}\int H_{\sigma}\left(f_{G(J),corona}^{\natural}\right)\ (\triangle_J^{\omega}g)\,\omega\right| \qquad (1.10)\\
\leq\ &\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}\left|\langle g,h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|\sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ G(J)\subset F\\(F,G(J))\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}}\left\langle H_{\sigma}\left(\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F}^{\sigma}|f|\right)\mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F}\right),h_J^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\\
\lesssim\ &\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}\langle\widetilde{g},h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ G(J)\subset F\\(F,G(J))\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F}^{\sigma}|f|\right)\frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F}\sigma\right)\ \langle x,h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\\
=\ &\sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(K)}\left\langle x,\sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}:\ J\subset J^*\\\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K}}\triangle_J^{\omega}\widetilde{g}\right\rangle_{\omega}\frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ K\subsetneqq F}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F}^{\sigma}|f|\right)\mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F}\sigma\right)\\
\leq\ &\sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(K)}\left\langle\frac{x}{|J^*|},\mathbf{1}_{J^*}g_K\right\rangle_{\omega}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathcal{M}_{\sigma}f\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the collection of functions

$$g_K\equiv\sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}\\\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K}}\triangle_J^{\omega}\widetilde{g},\qquad K\in\mathcal{F},$$

is $\mathcal{F}$-adapted as in Definition 6 above. Indeed, for $J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K$ we have $\widehat{g_K}(J)=\widehat{\widetilde{g}}(J)\geq 0$, and the orthogonality property

$$\langle g_K,g_{K'}\rangle_{\omega}=0,\qquad K,K'\in\mathcal{F}, \tag{1.11}$$

holds since if $J\in\mathcal{C}_G$, $J'\in\mathcal{C}_{G'}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G\neq\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G'$, then $J\neq J'$. Note also that we have the property

$$\left\langle\frac{x}{|J^*|},\mathbf{1}_{J^*}g_K\right\rangle_{\omega}=\sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}:\ J\subset J^*\\\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K}}\left|\langle g,h_J^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|\left\langle\frac{x}{|J^*|},h_J^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\geq 0. \tag{1.12}$$

Finally, property (3) of Definition 6 holds with overlap constant $C=2$. Indeed, if $J^*\subset I\subset F$ with $J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)$, there are two possibilities: either (i) $G(J^*)\subset I$ or (ii) $I\subsetneqq G(J^*)$. In the first possibility we have $F=F_{G(J^*)}$ and it is now easily seen that the J^* in case (i) are pairwise disjoint. In the second possibility, we have $G(J^*)=G(I)$, and again it is easily seen that the J^* in case (ii) are pairwise disjoint.

Since $\mathcal{F}$ is σ-Carleson, we can now apply the functional energy condition (2.1) to the right side of (1.10) with the choice $h=\mathcal{M}_{\sigma}f$. We have the maximal function estimate,

$$\|h\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)},$$

and so altogether we obtain that the right hand side of (1.10) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(K)}\left\langle \frac{x}{|J^*|},\mathbf{1}_{J^*}g_K\right\rangle_{\omega}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,h\sigma\right)\\
\leq\ \ & \mathfrak{F}\|h\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left[\sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}}\|g_K\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\right]^{1/2}\lesssim\mathfrak{F}\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|\widetilde{g}\|_{L^2(\omega)}\lesssim\mathfrak{F}\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

by (2.1) and (1.11).

This completes the proof that the first term on the left side of (1.1) is dominated by the larger term (1.2) on the right side. □

Now we turn to proving that the second term $\mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g)$ on the left side of (1.1) is dominated by the larger term (1.2) on the right side.

Proof. We claim that the mixed form $\mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g)$ defined in (0.4) in can be controlled in the same way that the far upper form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{H}_{far\ upper}(f,g) &= \sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ F\subset G}}\left\langle H_\sigma\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}}f,\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}_G}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\\
&= \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\sum_{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ F\subset G'}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}_G}\left\langle H_\sigma\,\triangle^{\sigma}_{I}\,f,\triangle^{\omega}_{J}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\\
&= \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\sum_{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ F\subset G'}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}_G}\left\langle\triangle^{\sigma}_{I}f,H_\omega\,\triangle^{\omega}_{J}\,g\right\rangle_{\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

would have been controlled in the first part of the proof of Proposition 2, where we actually estimated the *dual* form $\mathsf{H}_{far\ lower}$ instead.

Indeed, the only difference between the two forms is that in B_{mix} we have the arrangement of intervals

$$I\subset G'\subset G\subset F, \tag{1.13}$$

with $I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}$ and $J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}$, while in $\mathsf{H}_{far\ upper}$ we have instead the arrangement of intervals

$$I\subset F\subset G'\subset G,$$

with $I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}$ and $J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}$. To control $\mathsf{H}_{far\ upper}$ in the first part of the proof, we would have summed over J to obtain a function $\widehat{g}_F$, and applied the Monotonicity Lemma along with the dual functional energy condition. To control B_{mix} here, we do essentially the same, namely we sum over J to obtain a function $\widehat{g}_I$, and apply the Monotonicity Lemma along with the dual functional energy condition.

We write the mixed form $\mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g) &= \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{B}_{mix,F}(f,g);\\
\mathsf{B}_{mix,F}(f,g) &\equiv \sum_{G\sim F}\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\left(\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{F}}\right)\times\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}\\ I\Subset G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)}}\left\langle\triangle^{\sigma}_{I}f,H_\omega\,\triangle^{\omega}_{J}\,g\right\rangle_{\sigma}\\
&= \sum_{G\sim F}\sum_{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F:\ I\subset G'}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}\left\langle\triangle^{\sigma}_{I}f,H_\omega\,\triangle^{\omega}_{J}\,g\right\rangle_{\sigma}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

and prove the estimate,

$$\left|\mathsf{B}_{mix,F}\left(f,g\right)\right| \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}+\mathfrak{F}^{\ast}\right)\left\|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}}f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{F}}}g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}. \tag{1.14}$$

Then we can sum in $F\in\mathcal{F}$ and use Cauchy-Schwarz to obtain

$$\left|\mathsf{B}_{mix}\left(f,g\right)\right| \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}+\mathfrak{F}^{\ast}\right)\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}.$$

Here are the details.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{B}_{mix,F}\left(f,g\right) &= \sum_{G\sim F}\sum_{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F:\ I\subset G'}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}\left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I}f,H_{\omega}\triangle^{\omega}_{J}g\right\rangle_{\sigma}\\
&= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\sum_{G\sim F}\sum_{\substack{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)\\ I\subset G'}}\left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I}f,H_{\omega}\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}g\right\rangle_{\sigma}\\
&= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I}f,H_{\omega}\widehat{g}_{I}\right\rangle_{\sigma}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{g}_{I}\equiv\sum_{G\sim F:}\sum_{\substack{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)\\ I\subset G'}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}}\triangle^{\omega}_{J}g,$$

and we recall that $F\in\mathcal{F}$ is fixed. We now decompose this last sum according to whether or not the interval J is disjoint from I: $\widehat{g}_{I}=g^{\natural}_{I}+g^{\flat}_{I}$. As in the earlier argument, the term involving $g^{\flat}_{I}$ is handled by Lemma 2, and we arrange the intervals J occurring in the sum for

$$g^{\natural}_{I}\equiv\sum_{G\sim F}\sum_{\substack{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)\\ I\subset G'}}\sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}\\ I\subset J}}\triangle^{\omega}_{J}g,$$

into an increasing sequence of consecutive $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$-dyadic intervals $\left\{J_{k}\left(I\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{K}$. We also identify the increasing sequence of consecutive $\mathcal{G}$-stopping intervals $\left\{G_{n}\left(I\right)\right\}_{n=1}^{N}$ that contain I, as the subsequence with $\left\{J_{k_n}\left(I\right)\right\}_{n=1}^{N}$, i.e. $J_{k_n}\left(I\right)=G_{n}\left(I\right)$. It is important to observe that because of the arrangement of intervals in (1.13), we have

$$I\subset G'=G_{1}\left(I\right)\subset J_{1}\left(I\right)=\pi_{\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}G_{1}\left(I\right)\subset G_{N}\left(I\right)\subset J_{K}\left(I\right)=F.$$

Now we decompose

$$g^{\natural}_{I}=g^{\natural}_{I,local}+g^{\natural}_{I,corona}+g^{\natural}_{I,stopping}\ ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{\natural}_{I,local} &\equiv \left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{G_1(I)}g-\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F}g\right)\mathbf{1}_{G_1(I)}\ ,\\
g^{\natural}_{I,corona} &\equiv \sum_{k\geq k_1:\ \theta(J_k(I))\notin\mathcal{G}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{\theta(J_k(I))}g-\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F}g\right)\mathbf{1}_{\theta(J_k(I))}\ ,\\
g^{\natural}_{I,stopping} &\equiv \sum_{k\geq k_1:\ \theta(J_k(I))\in\mathcal{G}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{\theta(J_k(I))}g-\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F}g\right)\mathbf{1}_{\theta(J_k(I))}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

The form corresponding to the local function $g^{\natural}_{I,local} \equiv g^{@}_{G_1(I)}$ satisfies

$$\left|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} \left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f, H_{\omega} g^{\natural}_{I,local} \right\rangle_{\sigma}\right| = \left|\sum_{G\sim F} \sum_{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)} \sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}\\ G_1(I)=G'}} \left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f, H_{\omega} g^{@}_{G} \right\rangle_{\sigma}\right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left|\sum_{G\sim F} \left\langle \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f, H_{\omega}\left(\left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{G} g - \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F} g\right)\mathbf{1}_{G}\right) \right\rangle_{\sigma}\right| \\
&\leq \sum_{G\sim F} \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{G}\left|g\right| - \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F}\left|g\right|\right)\sqrt{\left|G\right|_{\omega}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{G\sim F} \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_{G}\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f\right\|^{2}_{L^2(\sigma)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{G\sim F} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{G}\left|g\right|\right)^{2}\left|G\right|_{\omega}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{F}}} g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} .
\end{aligned}$$

We next show that the form corresponding to the stopping function $g^{\natural}_{I,stopping}$ is controlled by the $\mathcal{A}_2$ condition alone upon using Lemma 7. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} \left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f, H_{\omega} g^{\natural}_{I,stopping} \right\rangle_{\sigma}\right| \\
&= \left|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} \left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f, H_{\omega}\left(\sum_{k\geq k_1:\ \theta(J_k(I))\in\mathcal{G}} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{\theta(J_k(I))} g - \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F} g\right)\mathbf{1}_{\theta(J_k(I))}\right)\right\rangle_{\sigma}\right| \\
&= \left|\sum_{G\sim F} \sum_{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}:\ I\subset\theta G'} \left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f, H_{\omega}\left(\left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{G'} g - \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F} g\right)\mathbf{1}_{G'}\right)\right\rangle_{\sigma}\right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{G\sim F} \sum_{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}:\ I\subset\theta G'} \left|\left\langle \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f, H_{\omega}\left(\left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{G'}\left|g\right|\right)\mathbf{1}_{G'}\right)\right\rangle_{\sigma}\right| \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}\left\|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{F}}} g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} ,
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 7. We remark that using $I \subset \theta G'$ in the final sum, we can replace $\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}$ with the classical constant $\sqrt{A_2}$ in the estimate above.

Finally, the form corresponding to the corona function $g^{\natural}_{I,corona}$ is controlled by the dual functional energy condition upon applying the Monotonicity Lemma 3 as follows. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{\natural}_{I,corona} &= \sum_{k\geq k_1:\ \theta(J_k(I))\notin\mathcal{G}} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{\theta(J_k(I))} g - \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F} g\right)\mathbf{1}_{\theta(J_k(I))} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \beta_{F,G_{n+1}(I)}\mathbf{1}_{G_{n+1}(I)}; \\
\beta_{F,G_{n+1}(I)} &\equiv \sum_{k_n\leq k<k_{n+1}:\ \theta(J_k(I))\notin\mathcal{G}} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{\theta(J_k(I))} g - \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{F} g\right)\mathbf{1}_{\theta(J_k(I))},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta_{F,G_{n+1}(I)}$ satisfies the pointwise estimate

$$\left|\beta_{F,G_{n+1}(I)}\left(x\right)\right| \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{G_{n+1}(I)}\left|g\right|\right)\mathbf{1}_{G_{n+1}(I)\setminus G_{n}(I)}\left(x\right).$$

Thus with

$$\widetilde{f}=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}\left|\langle f,h_I^\sigma\rangle_\sigma\right|h_I^\sigma,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}\left\langle\triangle_I^\sigma f,H_\omega g_{I,corona}^\natural\right\rangle_\sigma\right|\\
\lesssim&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}\left\langle\triangle_I^\sigma\widetilde{f},H_\omega\left(\sum_{n=1}^N\left(\mathbb{E}_{G_{n+1}(I)}^\omega|g|\right)\mathbf{1}_{G_{n+1}(I)\setminus G_n(I)}\right)\right\rangle_\sigma\\
=&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}\left\langle\triangle_I^\sigma\widetilde{f},H_\omega\left(\sum_{G\vdash F}\sum_{\substack{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_\mathcal{G}(G)\\ I\subset G'}}\sum_{G''\in\mathcal{G}:\ G'\subset G''\subset G}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''}^\omega|g|\right)\mathbf{1}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''\setminus G''}\right)\right\rangle_\sigma .
\end{aligned}$$

Here the notation $G\vdash F$ means that G is *maximal* with respect to the property $G\sim F$, and $\mathfrak{C}_\mathcal{G}(G)$ denotes the successor set of all $G'\in\mathcal{G}$ with $G'\subset G$.

Now we use the arguments surrounding (1.10) and (1.12) in the proof of Proposition 2 in order to apply the *dual* of the functional energy condition in (2.1). For convenience we write

$$\sum_{G\vdash F}\sum_{\substack{G'\in\mathfrak{C}_\mathcal{G}(G)\\ I\subset G'}}\sum_{G''\in\mathcal{G}:\ G'\subset G''\subset G}\equiv\sum_{G''\bowtie I}.$$

Then with $F(G)\equiv\pi_\mathcal{F}G$ and $I\subset I^*\subset\pi_\mathcal{G}I$ and $\mathcal{G}_F\equiv\{G\in\mathcal{G}:G\sim F\}$, the error estimate in the the Monotonicity Lemma 3 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}\left\langle\triangle_I^\sigma\widetilde{f},H_\omega\left(\sum_{G''\bowtie I}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''}^\omega|g|\right)\mathbf{1}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''\setminus G''}\right)\right\rangle_\sigma\\
\approx&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma}\left|\langle f,h_I^\sigma\rangle_\sigma\right|\sum_{G''\bowtie I}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''}^\omega|g|\right)\frac{1}{|I^*|}\mathrm{P}\left(I^*,\mathbf{1}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''\setminus G''}\omega\right)\ \langle x,h_I^\sigma\rangle_\sigma\\
=&\sum_{H\in\mathcal{G}_F}\sum_{I^*\in\mathcal{I}^*(H)}\left\langle\frac{x}{|I^*|},\sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{C}_{F(H)}^\sigma\cap\mathcal{C}_H^\omega\\ I\subset I^*}}\triangle_I^\sigma\widetilde{f}\right\rangle_\sigma\mathrm{P}\left(I^*,\sum_{\substack{G''\bowtie I\\ H\subset G''\subset F(H)}}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''}^\omega|g|\right)\mathbf{1}_{\pi_\mathcal{G}G''\setminus G''}\omega\right)\\
\leq&\sum_{H\in\mathcal{G}_F}\sum_{I^*\in\mathcal{I}^*(H)}\left\langle\frac{x}{|I^*|},\mathbf{1}_{I^*}f_H\right\rangle_\sigma\mathrm{P}\left(I^*,\left(\mathcal{M}_\omega g\right)\omega\right),
\end{aligned}\tag{1.15}$$

where the collection of functions

$$f_H\equiv\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_{F(H)}^\sigma\cap\mathcal{C}_H^\omega}\triangle_I^\sigma\widetilde{f},\qquad H\in\mathcal{G}_F,$$

is $\mathcal{G}_F$-adapted as in Definition 6 above. Indeed, for $I\in\mathcal{C}_{F(H)}^\sigma\cap\mathcal{C}_H^\omega$ we have $\widehat{f_H}(I)=\widehat{\widetilde{f}}(I)\geq0$, and the orthogonality property

$$\langle f_H,f_{H'}\rangle_\omega=0,\qquad H\neq H'\in\mathcal{G}_F,\tag{1.16}$$

holds since then $\mathcal{C}^\omega_H \cap \mathcal{C}^\omega_{H'} = \emptyset$. Note also that we have the property

$$\left\langle \frac{x}{|I^*|}, \mathbf{1}_{I^*} f_H \right\rangle_\sigma = \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F(H)} \cap \mathcal{C}^\omega_H \\ I \subset I^*}} |\langle f, h^\sigma_I \rangle_\omega| \left\langle \frac{x}{|I^*|}, h^\sigma_I \right\rangle_\sigma \geq 0. \tag{1.17}$$

Property (3) of Definition 6 holds here with overlap constant $C = 1$. Since $\mathcal{G}_F$ is ω-Carleson, we can now apply the inequality *dual* to the functional energy inequality (2.1) to the right side of (1.15), with the choice $h = \mathcal{M}_\omega \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_{\widetilde{F}}} g$. We have the maximal function estimate,

$$\|h\|_{L^2(\omega)} \lesssim \left\| \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_{\widetilde{F}}} g \right\|_{L^2(\omega)},$$

and so altogether we obtain that the right hand side of (1.15) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{I^* \in \mathcal{I}^*(H)} \left\langle \frac{x}{|I^*|}, \mathbf{1}_{I^*} f_H \right\rangle_\sigma \mathrm{P}\left(I^*, (\mathcal{M}_\omega g)\, \omega\right) \\ \leq\ & \mathfrak{F}^* \|h\|_\sigma \left[\sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}} \|f_H\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)} \right]^{1/2} \lesssim \mathfrak{F}^* \|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_{\widetilde{F}}} g\|_{L^2(\omega)} \|\widetilde{f}\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \\ \lesssim\ & \mathfrak{F}^* \left\| \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_F} f \right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \left\| \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_{\widetilde{F}}} g \right\|_{L^2(\omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

by the inequality dual to (2.1), and (1.16). This proves (1.14), and hence completes the proof of Proposition 2, but with the larger term (1.2) on the right side of (1.1). □

2. Controlling functional energy

In this subsection we prove that the functional energy conditions are implied by the strong $\mathcal{A}_2$ and interval testing conditions, thus completing the proof of the Intertwining Proposition 2.

Proposition 4. $\mathfrak{F} \lesssim \mathcal{A}_2 + \mathfrak{T}$ *and* $\mathfrak{F}^* \lesssim \mathcal{A}_2 + \mathfrak{T}^*$.

To prove this proposition we fix $\mathcal{F}$ as in (2.1) and set

$$\mu \equiv \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^* \in \mathcal{J}^*(F)} \left\| \mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*} \frac{x}{|J^*|} \right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \cdot \delta_{(c(J^*), |J^*|)}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathcal{J}^*(F)$ is defined in Definition 7, and the projections $\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*}$ onto Haar functions are defined by

$$\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*} \equiv \sum_{J \subset J^*:\ J \in \mathcal{J}(F)} \triangle^\omega_J.$$

We can replace x by $x - c$ for any choice of c we wish; the projection is unchanged. Here δ_q denotes a Dirac unit mass at a point q in the upper half plane $\mathbb{R}^2_+$.

We prove the two-weight inequality

$$\|\mathbb{P}(f\sigma)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+, \mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \tag{2.2}$$

for all nonnegative f in $L^2(\sigma)$, noting that $\mathcal{F}$ and f are *not* related here. Above, $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ denotes the Poisson extension to the upper half-plane, so that in particular

$$\|\mathbb{P}(f\sigma)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+, \mu)} = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^* \in \mathcal{J}^*(F)} \mathbb{P}(f\sigma)\left(c(J^*), |J^*|\right)^2 \left\| \mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*} \frac{x}{|J^*|} \right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)},$$

and so (2.2) implies (2.1) by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. By the two-weight inequality for the Poisson operator in [**Saw3**], inequality (2.2) requires checking these two inequalities

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)(x,t)^2\, d\mu\,(x,t) \equiv \left\|\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)\right\|^2_{L^2(\widehat{I},\mu)} \lesssim \left(A_2+\mathfrak{T}^2\right)\sigma(I)\,, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} [\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma(dx) \lesssim \mathcal{A}_2 \int_{\widehat{I}} t^2\mu(dx,dt), \tag{2.4}$$

for all *dyadic* intervals $I\in\mathcal{D}$, where $\widehat{I}=I\times[0,|I|]$ is the box over I in the upper half-plane, and

$$\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)=\int_{\widehat{I}}\frac{t^2}{t^2+|x-y|^2}\mu(dy,dt)\,.$$

It is important to note that we can choose for $\mathcal{D}$ any fixed dyadic grid, the compensating point being that the integrations on the left sides of (2.3) and (2.4) are taken over the entire spaces $\mathbb{R}^2_+$ and $\mathbb{R}$ respectively.

REMARK 6. *There is a gap in the proof of the Poisson inequality at the top of page 542 in* [**Saw3**]. *However, this gap can be fixed as in* [**SaWh**] *or* [**LaSaUr1**].

2.1. The Poisson testing inequality. We choose the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}$ in the testing conditions (2.3) and (2.4) to be the grid $\mathcal{D}^\omega$ that arises in the definition of the measure μ in (2.1). In particular all of the intervals J^* lie in the good subgrid $\mathcal{D}^\omega_{good}$ of $\mathcal{D}$. Fix $I\in\mathcal{D}$. We split the integration on the left side of (2.3) into a local and global piece:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 d\mu=\int_{\widehat{I}}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 d\mu+\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+\setminus\widehat{I}}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 d\mu.$$

The global piece turns out to be controlled solely by the $\mathcal{A}_2$ condition, so we leave that term for later, and turn now to estimating the local term.

An important consequence of the fact that I and J^* lie in the same grid $\mathcal{D}=\mathcal{D}^\omega$, is that $\left(c\left(J^*\right),\left|J^*\right|\right)\in\widehat{I}$ if and only if $J^*\subset I$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\widehat{I}}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)(x,t)^2\,d\mu\,(x,t)\\
&=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F):\ J^*\subset I}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)\left(c\left(J^*\right),\left|J^*\right|\right)^2\left\|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{|J^*|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\\
&=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F):\ J^*\subset I}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2\|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{|J^*|}\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the collections $\mathcal{J}^*\left(F\right)$ are pairwise disjoint for $F\in\mathcal{F}$, and that for $J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*\left(F\right)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{|J^*|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} &= \left\|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*}\left(\frac{x-E^\omega_{J^*}x}{|J^*|}\right)\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\\
&\leq \int_{J^*}\left|\frac{x-E^\omega_{J^*}x}{|J^*|}\right|^2 d\omega\,(x)=\mathsf{E}\left(J^*,\omega\right)^2\left|J^*\right|_\omega\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

In the first stage of the proof, we 'create some holes' by restricting the support of σ to the interval I in the sum below.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F):\ J^*\subset I} \mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{F\cap I}\sigma\right)^2 \left\Vert \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{\left\vert J^*\right\vert}\right\Vert^2_{L^2(\omega)}\\
&=\left\{\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ F\subset I}+\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ F\supset I}\right\}\ \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F):\ J^*\subset I} \mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{F\cap I}\sigma\right)^2 \left\Vert \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{\left\vert J^*\right\vert}\right\Vert^2_{L^2(\omega)}\\
&=A+B.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
A&\leq\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F):\ J^*\subset I}\mathrm{P}(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{F\cap I}\sigma)^2\mathsf{E}\left(J^*,\omega\right)^2\left\vert J^*\right\vert_{\omega}\\
&\leq\mathcal{E}_2\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sigma(F\cap I)\lesssim\left(A_2+\mathfrak{T}^2\right)\sigma(I)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that the constant $\mathcal{E}_2$, defined in the *energy condition*

$$\sup_{\dot\cup_{i=1}^{\infty}I_i\subset I}\sum_i\mathrm{P}(I_i,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma)^2\mathsf{E}\left(I_i,\omega\right)^2\left\vert I_i\right\vert_{\omega}\leq\mathcal{E}_2\left\vert I\right\vert_{\sigma}\,,\qquad I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma},$$

is controlled by the A_2 and testing constant $\mathfrak{T}$ (see [**LaSaUr**]). We also used that the stopping intervals $\mathcal{F}$ satisfy a σ-Carleson measure estimate,

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ F\subset F_0}\left\vert F\right\vert_{\sigma}\lesssim\left\vert F_0\right\vert_{\sigma}\,,$$

which implies that if $\{F_j\}$ are the maximal $F\in\mathcal{F}$ that are contained in I, then

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sigma(F\cap I)\leq\sum_j\sum_{F\subset F_j}\sigma(F)\lesssim\sum_j\sigma(F_j)\leq\sigma(I).$$

Now let $\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}\left(I\right)$ consist of those $J^*\subset I$ that lie in $\mathcal{J}^*\left(F\right)$ for some $F\supset I$. For $J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}\left(I\right)$ there are only two possibilities:

$$J^*\Subset I\text{ or }J^*\not\Subset I.$$

If $J^*\Subset I$ and $F\supset I$, then $J^*\Subset F$ by the definition of J^* good, and then by Property (3) in the definition of $\mathcal{J}\left(F\right)$, Definition 6, it follows that the intervals $J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}\left(I\right)$ with $J^*\Subset I$ have overlap bounded by C, independent of I. As for the other case $J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}\left(I\right)$ and $J^*\not\Subset I$, there are at most 2^{r+1} such intervals J^*, and they can be easily estimated without regard to their overlap if we let F_{J^*} be the unique interval $F_{J^*}\supset I$ with $J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*\left(F_{J^*}\right)$. Inequality (2.5) then shows that term B satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
B &\leq \left\{ \sum_{J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(I):\ J^*\Subset I} + \sum_{J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(I):\ J^*\not\Subset I} \right\} \mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F_I,J^*}\frac{x}{\left|J^*\right|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(I):\ J^*\Subset I} \mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 \mathsf{E}\left(J^*,\omega\right)^2 \left|J^*\right|_{\omega} \\
&\quad +2^{r+1} \sup_{J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(I):\ J^*\not\Subset I} \mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{\left|J^*\right|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_2\sigma(I) + 2^{r+1}\mathcal{E}_2\sigma(I) \lesssim \left(A_2+\mathfrak{T}^2\right)\sigma(I)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

since the intervals $J^*\in\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(I)$ with $J^*\Subset I$ have overlap bounded by C, independent of I.

It remains then to show the following inequality with 'holes':

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\ \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)} \mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right)^2 \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{\left|J^*\right|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \lesssim \left(A_2+\mathfrak{T}^2\right)\sigma(I)\,, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_I$ consists of those $F\in\mathcal{F}$ with $F\subset I$. Because of the holes, we are able to express this inequality in dual language via the pointwise control given in (1.2) of the Monotonicity Lemma 3:

$$\left\langle H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right),h^{\omega}_J\right\rangle_{\omega} \approx \frac{1}{\left|J^*\right|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\sigma\right)\ \left\langle x,h^{\omega}_J\right\rangle. \tag{2.7}$$

We will prove below that for any dyadic interval I,

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\ \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)} \left\langle H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right),\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\rangle_{\omega} \leq \mathfrak{T}\sigma(I)^{1/2}\left\|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)} g_{F,J^*}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}, \tag{2.8}$$

where the functions

$$g_{F,J^*} = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F):\ J\subset J^*} \left\langle g_{F,J^*},h^{\omega}_J\right\rangle_{\omega}\ h^{\omega}_J,$$

satisfy $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}g_{F,J^*}=g_{F,J^*}$, and are pairwise orthogonal in (F,J^*); and where the functions

$$\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*} = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F):\ J\subset J^*} \left|\left\langle g_{F,J^*},h^{\omega}_J\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|\ h^{\omega}_J,$$

satisfy the same conditions as the g_{F,J^*} and with the same $L^2(\omega)$ norms. Using the equivalence (1.2) in the Monotonicity lemma, together with $\left\langle\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*},h^{\omega}_J\right\rangle_{\omega}\geq 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.9) \qquad & \left|\left\langle H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right),g_{F,J^*}\right\rangle_\omega\right| \\
= \ & \left|\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F):\ J\subset J^*}\left\langle g_{F,J^*},h_J^\omega\right\rangle_\omega\ \left\langle H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right),h_J^\omega\right\rangle_\omega\right| \\
\approx \ & \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F):\ J\subset J^*}\left\langle \widetilde{g}_{F,J^*},h_J^\omega\right\rangle_\omega\ \left\langle H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right),h_J^\omega\right\rangle_\omega \\
\approx \ & \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F):\ J\subset J^*}\left\langle \widetilde{g}_{F,J^*},h_J^\omega\right\rangle_\omega\ \frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right)\ \left\langle x,h_J^\omega\right\rangle \\
= \ & \frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right)\ \left\langle \mathsf{P}_{F,J^*}^\omega x,\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\rangle_\omega .
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right)\ \left\langle \mathsf{P}_{F,J^*}^\omega x,g_{F,J^*}\right\rangle_\omega$$

can be viewed as an inner product, and since (2.9) and (2.8) give

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.10) \qquad & \left|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\frac{1}{|J^*|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right)\ \left\langle \mathsf{P}_{F,J^*}^\omega x,g_{F,J^*}\right\rangle_\omega\right| \\
\leq \ & \left(\mathfrak{T}+\sqrt{A_2}\right)\sigma(I)^{1/2}\left\|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}g_{F,J^*}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

since $\left\|\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}=\left\|g_{F,J^*}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}$, it then follows by duality that

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\frac{1}{|J^*|^2}\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right)^2\left\|\mathsf{P}_{F,J^*}^\omega x\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2\lesssim\left(\mathfrak{T}^2+A_2\right)\sigma(I),$$

which is (2.6). Thus it remains to prove (2.8).

The key to this is to note that we can now 'plug the hole' we created above in order to dualize (2.6) via the Monotonicity Lemma. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\left\langle H\left(\mathbf{1}_F\sigma\right),\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\rangle_\omega &\leq \mathfrak{T}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sigma(F\cap I)^{1/2}\left\|\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\
&\leq \mathfrak{T}\left[\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sigma(F\cap I)\times\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\left\|\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2\right]^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

And this gives us the inequality we want. The functions $\widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}$ are pairwise orthogonal in $L^2(w)$. And the intervals $\mathcal{F}$ are stopping intervals, hence satisfy a σ-Carleson measure estimate, which if $\{F_j\}$ are the maximal such F contained in I leads to

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\sigma(F\cap I)\leq\sum_j\sum_{F\subset F_j}\sigma(F)\lesssim\sum_j\sigma(F_j)\leq\sigma(I).$$

But it is trivial that

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_I}\ \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)} \left\langle H\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right), \widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\rangle_\omega \lesssim \mathfrak{T}\sigma(I)^{1/2}\left\|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F)} \widetilde{g}_{F,J^*}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},$$

and combined with the previous display and $H\left(\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus F}\sigma\right)=H\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)-H\left(\mathbf{1}_F\sigma\right)$, this yields (2.8). This completes the proof of the local part of the first testing condition (2.3).

Now we turn to proving the following estimate for the global part of the first testing condition (2.3):

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2\setminus\widehat{I}} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 d\mu \lesssim \mathcal{A}_2\left|I\right|_\sigma .$$

We begin by decomposing the integral on the left into four pieces:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2\setminus\widehat{I}} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 d\mu &= \sum_{J^*:\ (c(J^*),|J^*|)\in\mathbb{R}_+^2\setminus\widehat{I}} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)\left(c\left(J^*\right),\left|J^*\right|\right)^2 \sum_{F\sim J^*}\left\|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{\left|J^*\right|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\\
&= \left\{\sum_{\substack{J^*\cap 3I=\emptyset\\ |J^*|\leq|I|}} + \sum_{J^*\subset 3I\setminus I} + \sum_{\substack{J^*\cap I=\emptyset\\ |J^*|>|I|}} + \sum_{J^*\supsetneqq I}\right\} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)\left(c\left(J^*\right),\left|J^*\right|\right)^2 \sum_{F\sim J^*}\left\|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{\left|J^*\right|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\\
&= A+B+C+D.
\end{aligned}$$

We further decompose term A according to the length of J^* and its distance from I, and then use (2.5) and $\mathsf{E}\left(J^*,\omega\right)\leq 1$ to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
A &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\ \sum_{\substack{J^*\subset 3^{k+1}I\setminus 3^kI=\emptyset\\ |J^*|=2^{-n}|I|}} \left(\frac{2^{-n}\left|I\right|}{dist\left(J^*,I\right)^2}\left|I\right|_\sigma\right)^2 \left|J^*\right|_\omega\\
&\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-2n}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\left|I\right|^2\left|I\right|_\sigma\left|3^{k+1}I\setminus 3^kI\right|_\omega}{\left|3^kI\right|^4}\left|I\right|_\sigma\\
&\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-2n}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 3^{-2k}\left\{\frac{\left|3^{k+1}I\right|_\sigma\left|3^{k+1}I\right|_\omega}{\left|3^kI\right|^2}\right\}\left|I\right|_\sigma \lesssim A_2\left|I\right|_\sigma .
\end{aligned}$$

We further decompose term B according to the length of J^* and then use the Poisson inequality (2.6),

$$\mathrm{P}\left(J^*,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{\left|J^*\right|}{\left|I\right|}\right)^{2-4\varepsilon}\mathrm{P}\left(I,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2,$$

in Lemma 6, which requires the fact that our grid $\mathcal{D}^\omega_{good}$ is a good subgrid of $\mathcal{D}=\mathcal{D}^\omega$ as defined in Subsection 3. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\ \sum_{\substack{J^*\subset 3I\setminus I\\ |J^*|=2^{-n}|I|}} \left(2^{-n}\right)^{2-4\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\left|I\right|_\sigma}{\left|I\right|}\right)^2\left|J^*\right|_\omega\\
&\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(2^{-n}\right)^{2-4\varepsilon}\frac{\left|3I\right|_\sigma\left|3I\right|_\omega}{\left|3I\right|}\left|I\right|_\sigma \lesssim A_2\left|I\right|_\sigma .
\end{aligned}$$

For term C we will have to group the intervals J^* into blocks B_i, and then exploit the mutual orthogonality in the pairs (F, J^*) of the projections $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}$ defining μ, in order to avoid overlapping estimates. We first split the sum according to whether or not I intersects the triple of J^*:

$$\begin{aligned} C &\approx \left\{ \sum_{\substack{J^*:\ I\cap 3J^*=\emptyset \\ |J^*|>|I|}} + \sum_{\substack{J^*:\ I\subset 3J^*\setminus J^* \\ |J^*|>|I|}} \right\} \left(\frac{|J^*|}{dist\,(J^*,I)^2} \left|I\right|_{\sigma} \right)^2 \sum_{F\sim J^*} \left\| \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*} \frac{x}{|J^*|} \right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &= C_1 + C_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be the maximal intervals in the collection of triples

$$\left\{ 3J^* : |J^*| > |I| \text{ and } 3J^* \cap I = \emptyset \right\},$$

arranged in order of increasing side length. Below we will use the simple fact that the intervals B_i have bounded overlap, $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{B_i} \leq 3$. Now we further decompose the sum in C_1 by grouping the intervals J^* into the blocks B_i, and then using that $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*} x = \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*} \left(x - c\left(B_i\right)\right)$ along with the mutual orthogonality of the $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}$:

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{J^*:\ 3J^*\subset B_i} \left(\frac{|J^*|}{dist\,(J^*,I)^2} \left|I\right|_{\sigma} \right)^2 \sum_{F\sim J^*} \left\| \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*} \frac{x}{|J^*|} \right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{dist\,(B_i,I)^2} \left|I\right|_{\sigma} \right)^2 \sum_{J^*:\ 3J^*\subset B_i} \sum_{F\sim J^*} \left\| \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*} x \right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{dist\,(B_i,I)^2} \left|I\right|_{\sigma} \right)^2 \left\| \mathbf{1}_{B_i} \left(x - c\left(B_i\right)\right) \right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{dist\,(B_i,I)^2} \left|I\right|_{\sigma} \right)^2 \left|B_i\right|^2 \left|B_i\right|_{\omega} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left|B_i\right|_{\omega} \left|I\right|_{\sigma}}{\left|B_i\right|^2} \right\} \left|I\right|_{\sigma} \lesssim \mathcal{A}_2 \left|I\right|_{\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

since $dist\,(B_i, I) \approx |B_i|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left|B_i\right|_{\omega} \left|I\right|_{\sigma}}{\left|B_i\right|^2} &= \frac{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}{|I|} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|I|}{\left|B_i\right|^2} \left|B_i\right|_{\omega} \\ &\approx \frac{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}{|I|} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{B_i} \frac{|I|}{dist\,(x,I)^2} d\omega\left(x\right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}{|I|} \mathrm{P}\left(I,\omega\right) \leq \mathcal{A}_2, \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{B_i} \leq 3$.

Next we turn to estimating term C_2 where the triple of J^* contains I but J^* itself does not. Note that there are at most two such intervals J^* of a given length, one to the left and one to the right of I. So with this in mind we sum over the intervals J^* according to their lengths and use (2.5) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{J^*:\ I\subset 3J^*\setminus J^* \\ |J^*|=2^n|I|}} \left(\frac{|J^*|}{dist\left(J^*,I\right)^2}\left|I\right|_\sigma\right)^2 \sum_{F\sim J^*} \left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{|J^*|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{|I|_\sigma}{|2^nI|}\right)^2 \left|3\cdot 2^nI\right|_\omega = \left\{\frac{|I|_\sigma}{|I|}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\left|3\cdot 2^nI\right|_\omega}{\left|2^nI\right|^2}\right\}\left|I\right|_\sigma \\ &\lesssim \left\{\frac{|I|_\sigma}{|I|}\mathrm{P}\left(I,\omega\right)\right\}\left|I\right|_\sigma \leq \mathcal{A}_2\left|I\right|_\sigma , \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\left|3\cdot 2^nI\right|_\omega}{\left|2^nI\right|^2} = \int \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\left|2^nI\right|^2}\mathbf{1}_{3\cdot 2^nI}\left(x\right)\ d\omega\left(x\right) \lesssim \mathrm{P}\left(I,\omega\right).$$

Finally, we turn to term D, which is handled in the same way as term C_2. The intervals J^* occurring here are included in the set of ancestors $A_k \equiv \pi^{(k)}_{\mathcal{D}}I$ of I, $1\leq k<\infty$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)\left(c\left(A_k\right),\left|A_k\right|\right)^2 \sum_{F\sim A_k}\left\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}\frac{x}{|A_k|}\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{|I|_\sigma}{|A_k|}\right)^2\left|A_k\right|_\omega = \left\{\frac{|I|_\sigma}{|I|}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{|I|}{\left|A_k\right|^2}\left|A_k\right|_\omega\right\}\left|I\right|_\sigma \\ &\lesssim \left\{\frac{|I|_\sigma}{|I|}\mathrm{P}\left(I,\omega\right)\right\}\left|I\right|_\sigma \lesssim \mathcal{A}_2\left|I\right|_\sigma , \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{|I|}{\left|A_k\right|^2}\left|A_k\right|_\omega &= \int\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{|I|}{\left|A_k\right|^2}\mathbf{1}_{A_k(x)}d\omega\left(x\right) \\ &\lesssim \int\frac{|I|}{\left|I\right|^2+dist\left(x,I\right)^2}d\omega\left(x\right) = \mathrm{P}\left(I,\omega\right). \end{aligned}$$

REMARK 7. *The reduction to the testing condition here seems to be essential as one can't 'plug the hole' in the function setting.*

2.2. The dual Poisson testing inequality. Again we split the integration on the left side of (2.4) into local and global parts:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma = \int_I[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma + \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus I}[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma.$$

We begin with the local part. Note that

$$\int_{\widehat{I}}t^2d\mu\left(x,t\right) = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\,, \tag{2.11}$$

where we are using the dummy variable z to denote the argument of $\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}$ so as to avoid confusion with the integration variable x in $d\sigma\left(x\right)$. Compute

$$\mathbb{P}^*\left(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu\right)\left(x\right) = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{|J^*|^2+|x-c(J^*)|^2} \tag{2.12}$$

And so, it makes sense to expand the square. The diagonal term is

$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\int\left[\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{|J|^2+|x-c(J)|^2}\right]^2 d\sigma(x)\leq M_1\cdot\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \tag{2.13}$$

$$\textit{where}\quad M_1\equiv\sup_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sup_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\int\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{(|J^*|^2+|x-c(J^*)|^2)^2}\sigma(dx). \tag{2.14}$$

But, by inspection, M_1 is dominated by the $\mathcal{A}_2$ constant. Indeed, for any J^*, we have by (2.5)

$$\int\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{(|J^*|^2+|x-c(J^*)|^2)^2}\sigma(dx)\leq\frac{|J^*|_\omega}{|J^*|}\int\frac{|J^*|^3}{(|J^*|^2+|x-c(J^*)|^2)^2}\sigma(dx)\leq\mathcal{A}_2\,.$$

Having fixed ideas, we fix an integer s, and consider those intervals J and J' with $|J'|=2^{-s}|J|$, where we are now dropping the superscripts $*$ from the intervals J^*, but *not* from $\mathcal{J}^*(F)$, for clarity of display. The expression to control is

$$\begin{aligned}T_s&\equiv\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F)}\sum_{F'\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J'\in\mathcal{J}(F)\\ |J'|=2^{-s}|J|}}\int_I\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{|J|^2+|x-c(J)|^2}\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F',J'}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{|J'|^2+|x-c(J')|^2}\sigma(dx)\\&\leq M_2\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F)}\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{\omega}\end{aligned}$$

$$\textit{where}\quad M_2\equiv\sup_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sup_{J\in\mathcal{J}(F)}\sum_{F'\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J'\in\mathcal{J}(F)\\ |J'|=2^{-s}|J|}}\int_I\frac{1}{|J|^2+|x-c(J)|^2}\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F',J'}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{|J'|^2+|x-c(J')|^2}\sigma(dx).$$

We claim the term M_2 is at most a constant times $\mathcal{A}_2 2^{-s}$. To see , fix J as in the definition of M_2, and use (2.5) to estimate the integral on the right by

$$\frac{|J'|_\omega}{|J'|}\int_I\frac{|J'|^2}{|J|^2+|x-c(J)|^2}\frac{|J'|}{|J'|^2+|x-c(J')|^2}\sigma(dx)\lesssim\mathcal{A}_2\frac{2^{-2s}}{1+n^2}$$

where n is an integer chosen so that $(n-1)|J|\leq dist(J,J')\leq n|J|$. Then estimate the sum over J' as follows.

$$\sum_{F'\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J'\in\mathcal{J}^*(F')\,:\,|J'|=2^{-s}|J|\\ (n-1)|J|\leq dist(J,J')\leq n|J|}}\frac{2^{-2s}}{1+n^2}\lesssim\frac{2^{-s}}{1+n^2}\,.$$

because the relative lengths of J and J' are fixed. This is summable over $n\in\mathbb{N}$ to 2^{-s}, so it completes our proof of the local part of the second testing condition (2.4).

It remains to prove the following estimate for the global part of the second testing condition (2.4):

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus I}[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma\lesssim\mathcal{A}_2\,|I|_\sigma\,.$$

We decompose the integral on the left into two pieces:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus I}[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma=\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 3I}[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma+\int_{3I\setminus I}[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma=A+B.$$

We further decompose term A in annuli and use (2.12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}A &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{3^{n+1}I\setminus 3^nI}[\mathbb{P}^*(t\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{I}}\mu)]^2\sigma \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{3^{n+1}I\setminus 3^nI}\left[\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{|J^*|^2+|x-c(J^*)|^2}\right]^2 d\sigma(x) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{3^{n+1}I\setminus 3^nI}\left[\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\right]^2\frac{1}{|3^nI|^4}d\sigma(x).\end{aligned}$$

Now use (2.11) and

$$\int_{\widehat{I}}t^2d\mu=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\lesssim\|\mathbf{1}_I(z-c(I))\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\leq|I|^2|I|_{\omega}$$

to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}A &\lesssim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{3^{n+1}I\setminus 3^nI}\left[\int_{\widehat{I}}t^2d\mu\right]\left[|I|^2|I|_{\omega}\right]\frac{1}{|3^nI|^4}d\sigma(x) \\ &\lesssim \left\{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}3^{-2n}\frac{|3^{n+1}I|_{\omega}|3^{n+1}I|_{\sigma}}{|3^{n+1}I|^2}\right\}\left[\int_{\widehat{I}}t^2d\mu\right]\lesssim A_2\int_{\widehat{I}}t^2d\mu.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we estimate term B by using (2.12) to write

$$B=\int_{3I\setminus I}\left[\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{\substack{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)\\ J^*\subset I}}\frac{\|\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{F,J^*}z\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}}{|J^*|^2+|x-c(J^*)|^2}\right]^2 d\sigma(x),$$

and then expanding the square and calculating as in the proof of the local part given earlier. The details are similar and left to the reader.

2.3. General stopping data. Here we prove Proposition 3. Let $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g\in L^2(\omega)$. Suppose we are given stopping data for f as in Definition 1, i.e. a positive constant $C_0\geq 4$, a subset $\mathcal{F}$ of the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$, and a corresponding sequence $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}\equiv\{\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ of nonnegative numbers $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\geq 0$ satisfying

1. $\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_I|f|\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ for all $I\in\mathcal{C}_F$ and $F\in\mathcal{F}$,
2. $\sum_{F'\preceq F}|F'|_{\sigma}\leq C_0|F|_{\sigma}$ for all $F\in\mathcal{F}$,
3. $\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)^2|F|_{\sigma}\leq\left\|\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\mathbf{1}_F\right\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}\leq C_0^2\|f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}$,
4. $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')$ whenever $F',F\in\mathcal{F}$ with $F'\subset F$.

Note that we have here included in property (3) the quasiorthogonality inequality (0.7). Similarly, let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{G}} \equiv \left\{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(G)\right\}_{G\in\mathcal{G}}$ be stopping data for g. We begin by following the proof of Proposition 2, which makes no use of the explicit form of stopping data until we get to the telescoping sums in inequality (1.5), which now becomes

$$\left|f_G^{\natural}(x)\right| = \left|\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \triangle_{I_\ell}^{\sigma} f(x)\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}_{\theta(I_k(G))}^{\sigma} f - \mathbb{E}_{I_K}^{\sigma} f\right| \lesssim \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F_{n+1}) + \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(K) \leq 2\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F_{n+1}),$$

by properties (1) and (4) above. Then we proceed with the decomposition

$$f_G^{\natural} = f_{G,local}^{\natural} + f_{G,corona}^{\natural} + f_{G,stopping}^{\natural} .$$

The estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,local}^{\natural}\right)\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega} g\right)\omega\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{T}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},\\
\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,stopping}^{\natural}\right)\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega} g\right)\omega\right| &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},\\
\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,corona}^{\natural}\right)\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega} g\right)\omega\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{F}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

now all follow as in the previous proof using properties (1), (2), (3) and (4) above.

Indeed, using (1) and (4) as above, the estimate (1.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,local}^{\natural}\right)\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega} g\right)\omega\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{T}\left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)^2\left|F\right|_{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\left\|\mathsf{R}_F^{\omega} g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\lesssim \mathfrak{T}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have used property (3) above, together with the orthogonality of the projections $\mathsf{R}_F^{\omega} = \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}:\ F_1(G)=F} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega} g$. Then using (1) and (4) again, the estimate (1.8) becomes

$$\left|\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \int H_\sigma\left(f_{G,stopping}^{\natural}\right)\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^{\omega} g\right)\omega\right| \lesssim \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F) \sum_{J\subset\theta(F)} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathbf{1}_F\right), \triangle_J^{\omega} g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|,$$

which is dominated by $\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2}\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}$ upon application of Lemma 7 and property (2) above. Finally, using (1) and (4) yet again, the estimate (1.9) becomes

$$\left|\beta_{F_{n+1},G}(x)\right| \leq \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F_{n+1})\,\mathbf{1}_{F_{n+1}\setminus F_n}(x),$$

and this transforms the estimate (1.10) into

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \int H_{\sigma}\left(f^{\natural}_{G(J),corona} \right) \left(\triangle^{\omega}_{J} g \right) \omega \right| \\ \lesssim\ & \sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^{*}\in\mathcal{J}^{*}(K)} \left\langle x, \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}:\ J\subset J^{*} \\ \pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K}} \triangle^{\omega}_{J}\widetilde{g} \right\rangle_{\omega} \frac{1}{\left|J^{*}\right|}\mathrm{P}\left(J^{*}, \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ K\subsetneqq F} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}\left(\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\right) \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F}\sigma \right) \\ \leq\ & \sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^{*}\in\mathcal{J}^{*}(K)} \left\langle \frac{x}{\left|J^{*}\right|}, \mathbf{1}_{J^{*}} g_{K} \right\rangle_{\omega} \mathrm{P}\left(J^{*}, \mathcal{M}_{\alpha} f \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha} f \equiv \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}\left(F\right) \mathbf{1}_{F}$$

substitutes for the maximal function $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma} f$ used earlier. Now we use property (3), together with the fact that the collection of functions $\left\{g_{K}\right\}_{K\in\mathcal{F}}$ is $\mathcal{F}$-adapted as in Definition 6, to obtain the bound

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^{*}\in\mathcal{J}^{*}(K)} \left\langle \frac{x}{\left|J^{*}\right|}, \mathbf{1}_{J^{*}} g_{K} \right\rangle_{\omega} \mathrm{P}\left(J^{*}, \mathcal{M}_{\alpha} f \right) \lesssim \mathfrak{F} \left\| f \right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)} \left\| g \right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)} .$$

This establishes the bound for the first term on the left side of (1.1) in Proposition 3, but with the constant $\mathfrak{NTV} + \mathfrak{F} + \mathfrak{F}^{*}$ on the right side. Proposition 4 now applies to complete the proof of Proposition 3. The proof for the second term $\mathsf{B}_{mix}\left(f,g\right)$ on the left side of (1.1) is also similar to the corresponding proof in Proposition 2, using only modifications of the type already described above. Proposition 4 now applies to complete the proof of Proposition 3.

2.4. Proof of the Iterated Corona Proposition.

We can now prove the Iterated Corona Proposition 1. For this we return to the parallel corona splitting (0.6), but with general stopping data for each of f and g. We then decompose the far form $\mathsf{H}_{far}\left(f,g\right)$ into lower and upper forms in analogy with $\mathcal{H}_{lower}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{upper}$ in (0.5):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{H}_{far}\left(f,g\right) &= \left\{ \sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}) \\ G\subset F}} + \sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}) \\ F\subset G}} \right\} \left\langle H_{\sigma}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_{F}} f, \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}_{G}} g \right\rangle_{\omega} \\ &\equiv \mathsf{H}_{far\ lower}\left(f,g\right) + \mathsf{H}_{far\ upper}\left(f,g\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let N_{near}, $\mathsf{N}_{disjoint}$, $\mathsf{N}_{far\ lower}$ and $\mathsf{N}_{far\ upper}$ be the bounds for the nonlinear corona forms $\mathsf{H}_{near}\left(f,g\right)$, $\mathsf{H}_{disjoint}\left(f,g\right)$, $\mathsf{H}_{far\ lower}\left(f,g\right)$ and $\mathsf{H}_{far\ upper}\left(f,g\right)$. As mentioned earlier, Lemma 2 gives

$$\mathsf{N}_{disjoint} \lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}.$$

Our goal here is to show the inequality

$$\mathsf{N}_{far\ lower} + \mathsf{N}_{far\ upper} \lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}. \tag{2.16}$$

By symmetry, it suffices to consider $\mathsf{N}_{far\ lower}$, and since the form $\mathsf{H}_{far\ lower}\left(f,g\right)$ is controlled by the Intertwining Proposition 2, we have

$$\mathsf{N}_{far\ lower} + \mathsf{N}_{far\ upper} \lesssim \mathfrak{NTV},$$

which completes the proof of the Iterated Corona Proposition 1.

CHAPTER 5

Decomposing the functions

We apply three different corona decompositions in succession to the function $f \in L^2(\sigma)$, gaining structure with each application; first to bounded fluctuation for f, then to minimal bounded fluctuation for f, and finally to regularizing the weight σ. The same is done for $g \in L^2(\omega)$. Finally, we combine these decompositions for f and g into a *triple* parallel corona decomposition to which the Iterated Corona Proposition 1 and the Intertwining Proposition 3 apply.

1. Bounded fluctuation

The connection between bounded fluctuation and the corona projections $\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f$ in the CZ decomposition of f is given in Lemma 8 below. We need the following definition. Given $\gamma > 1$, an interval $K \in \mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ and a function f supported on K, we say that f is a γ-*simple* function of *bounded fluctuation* on K, written $f \in \mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$, if there is a pairwise disjoint collection $\mathcal{K}$ of $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$-subintervals of K such that

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{K' \in \mathcal{K}} a_{K'} \mathbf{1}_{K'}, \\ a_{K'} &> \gamma, \qquad K' \in \mathcal{K}, \\ \frac{1}{|I|_{\sigma}} \int_I f\sigma &\leq 1, \qquad I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = \{ I \in \mathcal{D}^{\sigma} : I \subset K \text{ and } I \supsetneqq K' \text{ for some } K' \in \mathcal{K} \}.$$

Using the facts that $\frac{1}{|I|_{\sigma}} \int_I |f| \sigma \leq 1$ for $I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\frac{1}{|I|_{\sigma}} \int_I |f| \sigma > \gamma$ for $I \in \mathcal{K}$, it is easy to see that the collection $\mathcal{K}$ is uniquely determined by the simple function f of bounded fluctuation, so we will typically write $\mathcal{K}_f$ for this collection when $f \in \mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$. Note that functions in $\mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$, unlike those in $\mathcal{BF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$, do *not* have vanishing mean.

Remark 8. *There is a more general notion of simple function of bounded fluctuation on K, that permits f to take on both positive and negative values, namely we say that $f \in \mathcal{GBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$ if we only require $|a_{K'}| > \gamma$ for $K' \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\frac{1}{|I|_{\sigma}} \int_I |f| \sigma \leq 1$ for $I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ along with the other restrictions. However, every function in $\mathcal{GBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$ can be written as the difference of two functions in $\mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$, and it will be a key point in the proof of Proposition 5 that all the values of such f can take a single sign.*

Lemma 8. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is a stopping collection for $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ with Calderón-Zygmund stopping constant $C_0 \geq 4$. Given $\gamma > 1$, there is for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ a* *decomposition,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f &= \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_1 + \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2 ; \\ \left| \frac{1}{(C_0\gamma + \gamma + 1)\, \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|} \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_1 \right| &\leq \mathbf{1}_F , \\ \frac{1}{(C_0 + 1)\, \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|} \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2 &\in \mathcal{GBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(F) .\end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f &= (C_0\gamma + \gamma + 1)\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|\right)\ h_0 + (C_0 + 1)\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|\right)\ h_1 ; \\ h_i &\in \mathcal{BF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(F) , \qquad i = 1, 2.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. To obtain (1.1), fix $F \in \mathcal{F}$ for the moment, and write

$$\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f = \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f + \mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{F}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f ,$$

where

$$\widehat{F} \equiv F \setminus \widetilde{F} \text{ and } \widetilde{F} \equiv \bigcup_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}(F)} F' .$$

Then if $x \in \widehat{F}$ we have

$$\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}(F)} f(x) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}_F} \triangle^{\sigma}_I f(x) = \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K(x)} f - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F f ,$$

where $K(x)$ is the smallest child of any interval in the corona $\mathcal{C}_F$ that contains x. Thus

$$\left|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f(x)\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x)\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K(x)} f - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F f\right|\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x) \leq (C_0 + 1)\ \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x) , \tag{1.2}$$

where C_0 is the Calderón-Zygmund stopping constant, and

$$\mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{F}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f = \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}(F)} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'} .$$

Now let

$$\mathfrak{C}_{big}(F) = \left\{F' \in \mathfrak{C}(F) : \left|\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F f\right| > (C_0\gamma + \gamma + 1)\, \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|\right\} ,$$

set $\mathfrak{C}_{small}(F) = \mathfrak{C}(F) \setminus \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)$, and then define

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_1 &= \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f(x) + \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{small}(F)} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'} , \\ \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2 &= \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'} ,\end{aligned}$$

to obtain the decomposition (1.1).

Indeed, from (1.2) and the definition of $\mathfrak{C}_{small}(F)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_1\right| &\leq \max\left\{\left\|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f(x)\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x)\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\sigma)} , \sup_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{small}(F)} \left|\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F f\right|\right\} \\ &\leq (C_0\gamma + \gamma + 1)\, \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f| .\end{aligned}$$

To see that $\frac{1}{(C_0+1)\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f|}\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2 \in \mathcal{GBF}_\sigma(F)$, take $I \subset F$ such that $I \supsetneqq F'$ for some $F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I \left|\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2\right| \sigma &= \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I \left|\sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F):\ F' \subset I} \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'}\right| \sigma \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f| + \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I \left(\sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F):\ F' \subset I} \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{F'} |f|\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'}\right) \sigma \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f| + \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I |f| \sigma \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f| + \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma} C_0 \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f| \, |I|_\sigma \leq (C_0+1)\, \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f|,
\end{aligned}$$

where C_0 is the Calderón-Zygmund stopping constant. On the other hand, for $F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|F'|_\sigma}\int_{F'} \left|\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2\right| \sigma &= \left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F f\right| > (C_0\gamma + \gamma + 1)\, \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f| - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f| \\
&= (C_0+1)\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F |f|\right)\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

□

2. Minimal bounded fluctuation

In order to continue the proof of Theorem 2, we must make a crucial decomposition of functions $f \in \mathcal{BF}_\sigma(K)$ into bounded functions and functions of *minimal* bounded fluctuation, the latter functions having a great deal of additional structure owing to their minimal Haar support. We will present the decomposition in three stages, first to bounded and *simple* functions of bounded fluctuation, then to bounded and *prebounded* and *prefluctuation* functions, and finally to bounded and functions of *minimal* bounded fluctuation.

We begin by recalling from Definition 3 that $f \in \mathcal{BF}_\sigma(K)$ if it is supported in K with mean zero, and equals a constant $a_{K'}$ of modulus greater than γ on any subinterval K' where $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'}|f| > 1$. If we require in addition that

$$a_{K'} > \gamma, \qquad K' \in \mathcal{K}_f,$$

then we denote the resulting collection of functions by $\mathcal{PBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(K)$. Recall also that $\mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(K)$ consists of those functions $f \in \mathcal{PBF}_\sigma(K)$ for which $f = \sum_{K' \in \mathcal{K}_f} a_{K'} \mathbf{1}_{K'}$. We have the following simple decomposition.

Lemma 9. *Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{BF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(K)$. Then we can write*

$$f = h_{bdd} + h^+_{fluc} - h^-_{fluc},$$

where $h_{bdd} \in \left(L^\infty_K\right)_1(\sigma)$ and $h^\pm_{fluc} \in \mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(K)$.

Proof. We simply define

$$\begin{aligned} h_{fluc}^{+} &\equiv \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_f:\ a_{K'}>\gamma} a_{K'}\mathbf{1}_{K'}, \\ h_{fluc}^{-} &\equiv \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_f:\ a_{K'}<\gamma} a_{K'}\mathbf{1}_{K'}, \\ h_{bdd} &\equiv f\mathbf{1}_{K\setminus \bigcup_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_f} K'}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now prepare to give our main proposition on decomposing a function of bounded fluctuation into a sum of bounded and *minimal* bounded fluctuation functions, which we refer to as restricted bounded fluctuation functions. We set

$$\begin{aligned} L_F^{\infty}(\sigma) &\equiv \left\{ f\in L^{\infty}(\sigma) : supp\ f\subset F \text{ and } \int_K f d\sigma = 0 \right\}, \\ L_F^{\infty}(\sigma)_1 &\equiv \left\{ f\in L_F^{\infty}(\sigma) : \|f\|_{L^{\infty}(\sigma)} \leq 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 9. *Define the set of functions $\mathcal{RBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(F)$ of* restricted *bounded fluctuation on F by*

$$\mathcal{RBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(F) \equiv \mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(F) + L_F^{\infty}(\sigma)_1 \ .$$

Next, we record a decomposition of f into prebounded and prefluctuation functions in part (1) of the proposition.

Definition 10. *Let $\gamma \geq 4$. A function f supported on an interval $K\in\mathcal{D}$ is a* prebounded *function on K if*

$$\left\|\triangle_I^{\sigma} f\right\|_{\infty} \leq 4, \qquad \textit{for all } I\in\mathcal{D}.$$

A function f supported on an interval $K\in\mathcal{D}$ is a prefluctuation^{+} *function on K, respectively a* prefluctuation^{-} *function on K, (relative to γ) if*

$$\sup_I \triangle_I^{\sigma} f > \gamma \textit{ and } \mathbb{E}_I^{\sigma}\left|\triangle_I^{\sigma} f\right| \leq 2, \qquad \textit{for all } I \textit{ such that } \widehat{f}(I)\neq 0,$$

respectively

$$\inf_I \triangle_I^{\sigma} f_{fluc}^{+} < -\gamma \textit{ and } \mathbb{E}_I^{\sigma}\left|\triangle_I^{\sigma} f\right| \leq 2, \qquad \textit{for all } I \textit{ such that } \widehat{f}(I)\neq 0.$$

The point of these definitions is that the following properties hold: the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition of a prebounded function has corona projections that are *bounded*, and the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition of a prefluctuation function has corona projections that are of *restricted bounded fluctuation*. In general, neither of these properties hold for Calderón-Zygmund corona projections of general functions when the measure σ is nondoubling.

Finally, we note that our decomposition below is *infinite*, and necessarily so by the example in the appendix.

Proposition 5. *Suppose that $f\in\mathcal{BF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(K)$ as in Definition 3 with $\gamma\geq 16$.*

(1) *There is a decomposition*

$$f = f_{bdd} + f^{+}_{fluc} - f^{-}_{fluc}, \tag{2.1}$$

of f into prebounded and prefluctuation$^{\pm}$ functions $f_{bdd}, f^{+}_{fluc}, f^{-}_{fluc}$ on K, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f_{bdd}\right\|_{\infty} &\leq 4, \qquad I \in \mathcal{D}, \\
\sup_{I} \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f^{+}_{fluc} &> \gamma \text{ and } \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{I}\left|\triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f^{+}_{fluc}\right| \leq 2, \qquad \widehat{f^{+}_{fluc}}(I) \neq 0, \\
\inf_{I} \triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f^{-}_{fluc} &< -\gamma \text{ and } \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{I}\left|\triangle^{\sigma}_{I} f^{-}_{fluc}\right| \leq 2, \qquad \widehat{f^{-}_{fluc}}(I) \neq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

(2) *There are collections of stopping data for f_{bdd} and $f^{\pm}_{fluc}$, with stopping times $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\pm}$, and corona projections $f_{bdd,S} \equiv \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_S} f_{bdd}$ and $f^{\pm}_{fluc,T} \equiv \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{T}^{\pm}}} f^{\pm}_{fluc}$, that satisfy Carleson conditions*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{S' \subset S} \left|S'\right|_{\sigma} &\leq 4\left|S\right|_{\sigma}, \qquad S \in \mathcal{S}, \\
\sum_{T' \subset T} \left|T'\right|_{\sigma} &\leq 4\left|T\right|_{\sigma}, \qquad T \in \mathcal{T}^{\pm},
\end{aligned}$$

and a quasi-orthogonal decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= f_{bdd} + f^{+}_{fluc} - f^{-}_{fluc}, \\
&= \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} f_{bdd,S} + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}^{+}} f^{+}_{fluc,T} - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}^{-}} f^{-}_{fluc,T}, \\
\left\|f\right\|^{2}_{L^{2}(\sigma)} &\approx \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \left\|f_{bdd,S}\right\|^{2}_{L^{2}(\sigma)} + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}^{+}} \left\|f^{+}_{fluc,T}\right\|^{2}_{L^{2}(\sigma)} + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}^{-}} \left\|f^{-}_{fluc,T}\right\|^{2}_{L^{2}(\sigma)},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

such that for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}^{\pm}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{1}{5\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{S}\left|f_{bdd}\right|} f_{bdd,S}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(S)} &\leq 1, \\
\frac{1}{30\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{T}\left|f^{\pm}_{fluc}\right|} f^{\pm}_{fluc,T} &\in \mathcal{RBF}^{\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}_{\sigma}(T).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Note that we do not assert any control on the averages $\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K}\left|f_{bdd}\right|$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K}\left|f^{\pm}_{fluc}\right|$ in Proposition 5. The quasi-orthogonality in (2.2) is, together with (2.3) and the Carleson conditions, sufficient to adequately control the $L^{2}(\sigma)$ norm of f.

Proof. We begin by applying Lemma 9 to obtain a splitting

$$f = h_{bdd} + h^{+}_{fluc} - h^{-}_{fluc},$$

where $\left\|h_{bdd}\right\|_{\infty} \leq 1$ and $h^{\pm}_{fluc} \in \mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K)$. If we write

$$h^{\pm}_{fluc} = \left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K} h^{\pm}_{fluc}\right)\mathbf{1}_{K} + g^{\pm}_{fluc},$$

then $g^{\pm}_{fluc} \in \mathcal{PBF}^{\left(\frac{\gamma-1}{2}\right)}_{\sigma}(K)$ provided $\gamma > 1$ is chosen large enough. Fix a sign ± and for convenience write $g = g^{\pm}_{fluc}$ momentarily. Since $\int_{K} g\sigma = 0$ and g is constant on each $K' \in \mathcal{K}_g$, we have

$$supp\ \widehat{g} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{K}_g} \equiv \{I \subset K : I \not\subset K' \text{ for any } K' \in \mathcal{K}_g\}.$$

Now we split $\widehat{\mathcal{K}_g}$ into two pairwise disjoint subsets:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{K}_g} &= \left\{I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}_g} : \|\triangle_I^\sigma g\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma-1}{2}\right\} \dot{\bigcup} \left\{I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}_g} : \sup_I \triangle_I^\sigma g > \frac{\gamma-1}{2}\right\} \\ &\equiv \widehat{\mathcal{K}_g}\,(bounded) \dot{\bigcup} \widehat{\mathcal{K}_g}\,(\text{positive}).\end{aligned}$$

If we write I_{small} and I_{large} for the two children of I where $|I_{small}|_\sigma \leq |I_{large}|_\sigma$, then we have

$$\triangle_I^\sigma\, g = \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_{small}}^\sigma g - \mathbb{E}_I^\sigma g\right) \mathbf{1}_{I_{small}} + \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_{large}}^\sigma g - \mathbb{E}_I^\sigma g\right) \mathbf{1}_{I_{large}}, \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}_I^\sigma |g| \leq 1 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{I_{large}}^\sigma |g| \leq 1 \text{ for } I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}_g},$$

since $g \in \mathcal{BF}_\sigma^{\left(\frac{\gamma-1}{2}\right)}(K)$. It follows that if $\|\triangle_I^\sigma g\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma-1}{2}$, then in fact we have the better bound $\|\triangle_I^\sigma g\|_\infty \leq 2$, so that

$$\|\triangle_I^\sigma g\|_\infty \leq 2, \qquad I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}_g}\,(bounded). \tag{2.5}$$

It also follows that if I belongs to $\widehat{\mathcal{K}_g}$ (positive), then

$$\frac{\gamma-3}{2} < \left|\mathbb{E}_{I_{small}}^\sigma g\right| \leq \mathbb{E}_{I_{small}}^\sigma |g| \leq \frac{|I|_\sigma}{|I_{small}|_\sigma} \mathbb{E}_I^\sigma |g| \leq \frac{|I|_\sigma}{|I_{small}|_\sigma},$$

which shows that $I_{small} \in \mathcal{K}_g$, i.e. $I \in \pi\mathcal{K}_g$, and in addition that

$$|I_{small}|_\sigma < \frac{2}{\gamma-3} |I|_\sigma.$$

Now recalling that $g = g_{fluc}^\pm$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} f_{bdd}^\pm &= \sum_{I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^\pm}}(bounded)} \triangle_I^\sigma g_{fluc}^\pm, \\ f_{fluc}^\pm &= \sum_{I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^\pm}}(\text{positive})} \triangle_I^\sigma g_{fluc}^\pm, \\ f_{bdd} &= h_{bdd} + \left(\mathbb{E}_K^\sigma h_{fluc}^+\right) \mathbf{1}_K - \left(\mathbb{E}_K^\sigma h_{fluc}^-\right) \mathbf{1}_K + f_{bdd}^+ - f_{bdd}^-, \end{aligned}$$

and note that so far we have shown

$$\begin{aligned} \|\triangle_I^\sigma f_{bdd}\|_\infty &\leq \left\|\triangle_I^\sigma \left[h_{bdd} + \left(\mathbb{E}_K^\sigma h_{fluc}^+\right) \mathbf{1}_K - \left(\mathbb{E}_K^\sigma h_{fluc}^-\right) \mathbf{1}_K\right]\right\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \left\|\triangle_I^\sigma \left(f_{bdd}^+ - f_{bdd}^-\right)\right\|_\infty \\ &\leq 6 + 4 = 10, \qquad I \in \mathcal{D}, \\ supp\ \widehat{f_{fluc}^\pm} &= \widehat{\mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^\pm}}\,(\text{positive}) = \pi\mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^\pm}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

for $\gamma > 1$ large enough. This establishes (2.1).

Now we apply a standard Calderón-Zygmund decomposition to f_{bdd} to obtain stopping times $\mathcal{S}$ with top interval $S_0 = K$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Child\left(S_0\right) &\equiv \left\{S \in \mathcal{D} : S \subset S_0 = K \text{ is maximal w.r.t. } \mathbb{E}_S^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right| > 4\mathbb{E}_{S_0}^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right|\right\}, \\ Child\left(S\right) &\equiv \left\{S' \in \mathcal{D} : S' \subset S \text{ is maximal w.r.t. } \mathbb{E}_{S'}^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right| > 4\mathbb{E}_S^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right|\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$f_{bdd} = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_S}^\sigma f_{bdd}.$$

Now comes the first crucial point. The functions $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_S}^\sigma f_{bdd}$ are *bounded* by $5\mathbb{E}_S^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right|$ if $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Indeed, with the notation $\widetilde{S} \equiv \bigcup_{S' \in Child(S)} S'$ and $\widehat{S} \equiv S \setminus \widetilde{S}$, we have for $S \neq S_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_S}^\sigma f_{bdd}\right\|_\infty &\leq \max\left\{\left\|\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{S}} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_S}^\sigma f_{bdd}\right\|_\infty, \left\|\mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{S}} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_S}^\sigma f_{bdd}\right\|_\infty\right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{4\mathbb{E}_S^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right|, \sup_{S' \in Child(S)} \left|\mathbb{E}_{S'}^\sigma f_{bdd} - \mathbb{E}_S^\sigma f_{bdd}\right|\right\} \leq 5\mathbb{E}_S^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right|, \end{aligned}$$

since (2.4) and (2.5) give

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{S'}^\sigma f_{bdd}\right| \leq \left\|\triangle_{\pi S'}^\sigma f_{bdd}\right\|_\infty + \left|\mathbb{E}_{\pi S'}^\sigma f_{bdd}\right| \leq 1 + 4\mathbb{E}_S^\sigma \left|f_{bdd}\right|.$$

This completes the proof of the first half of (2.3).

Now we turn to the function f_{fluc}^+ and apply a standard Calderón-Zygmund decomposition to f_{fluc}^+ and obtain stopping times $\mathcal{T}^+$ and coronas $\left\{\mathcal{C}_T\right\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}^+}$ with top stopping interval $T_0 = K$ such that

$$f_{fluc}^+ = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}^+} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_T}^\sigma f_{fluc}^+.$$

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}^+$ and let $Child_{\mathcal{T}^+}\left(T\right)$ be the collection of $\mathcal{T}^+$-children T' of T. We set

$$\mathcal{C}_T^* \equiv \left\{I \in \mathcal{C}_T : \widehat{f_{fluc}^+}\left(I\right) \neq 0\right\} = \mathcal{C}_T \cap \pi\mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^+},$$

and denote by

$$\mathfrak{C}_{g_{fluc}^+}\left(T\right) \equiv \mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^+} \cap Child_{\mathcal{T}^+}\left(T\right),$$

those $\mathcal{T}^+$-children $T' \in Child_{\mathcal{T}^+}\left(T\right)$ belonging to $\mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^+}$. Now set

$$\mathfrak{C}_{g_{fluc}^+}^{(\beta)}\left(T\right) \equiv \left\{T' \in \mathfrak{C}_{g_{fluc}^+}\left(T\right) : \mathbb{E}_{T'}^\sigma \triangle_{\pi T'}^\sigma f > \left(\beta + 5\right) \mathbb{E}_T^\sigma \left|f_{fluc}^+\right|\right\}$$

and define

$$\psi_T^1 \equiv \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{C}_{g_{fluc}^+}^{(\beta)}\left(T\right)} \triangle_{\pi T'}^\sigma f$$

to be the Haar projection of f onto $\pi\mathfrak{C}_{g_{fluc}^+}^{(\beta)}\left(T\right)$. To orient the reader, we point out that there are four pairwise disjoint classes of intervals K' in $\mathcal{K}_{g_{fluc}^+}$ that are subsets of T:

$$\begin{aligned} Class_T(1) &\equiv \left\{K' \in \mathcal{K}_{g^+_{fluc}} : K' \in \mathcal{C}_T\right\}, \\ Class_T(2) &\equiv \mathfrak{C}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T) \setminus \mathfrak{C}^{(\beta)}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T), \\ Class_T(3) &\equiv \mathfrak{C}^{(\beta)}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T), \\ Class_T(4) &\equiv \left\{K' \in \mathcal{K}_{g^+_{fluc}} : K' \subsetneqq T' \text{ for some } T' \in Child_{\mathcal{T}^+}(T)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For those $K' \in Class_T(1)$, we have

$$\left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'}\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T} f^+_{fluc}\right)\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'} f^+_{fluc} - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_T f^+_{fluc}\right| \leq 5\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T \left|f^+_{fluc}\right|, \tag{2.7}$$

and for those $K' \in Class_T(2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'}\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T} f^+_{fluc}\right)\right| &\leq \left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'} \triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'} f\right| + \left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\pi K'} f^+_{fluc} - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_T f^+_{fluc}\right| \\ &\leq (\beta + 5)\,\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T \left|f^+_{fluc}\right| + 5\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T \left|f^+_{fluc}\right|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

When $K' \in Class_T(4)$, the Haar projections $\triangle^\sigma_{\pi T'} f$ are not included in the Haar support of $\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T} f^+_{fluc}$. Thus it is the $K' \in Class_T(3) = \mathfrak{C}^{(\beta)}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T)$ that can arise as the distinguished intervals for a restricted bounded fluctuation function, and this is what motivates the definition of ψ^1_T above.

Suppose I is an interval in the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ that is *not* contained in any K' in $Class_T(1) \cup \mathfrak{C}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T)$. We first note that

$$\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I \left|f^+_{fluc}\right| \leq 4\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T \left|f^+_{fluc}\right|.$$

Indeed, let L be the smallest interval in the corona $\mathcal{C}_T$ that contains I. From our choice of I, it follows that either $I = L \in \mathcal{C}_T$ and

$$\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I \left|f^+_{fluc}\right| = \mathbb{E}^\sigma_L \left|f^+_{fluc}\right| \leq 4\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T \left|f^+_{fluc}\right|,$$

or the child L_I of L that contains I is also in the corona $\mathcal{C}_T$ and

$$\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I \left|f^+_{fluc}\right| = \mathbb{E}^\sigma_{L_I} \left|f^+_{fluc}\right| \leq 4\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T \left|f^+_{fluc}\right|.$$

Set $L^* = L$ or L_I according to whether or not $I \in \mathcal{C}_T$, and note that $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I \left|\psi^1_T\right| = \mathbb{E}^\sigma_{L^*} \left|\psi^1_T\right|$.

Now comes the second crucial point. The definition of f^+_{fluc} implies the inequalities

$$\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'} \triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'} f > \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} \text{ and } \mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\theta K'} \triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'} f < 0, \tag{2.9}$$

as $\triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi K'} f$ has mean zero. Thus the expectations $\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{L^*} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi K'} f$ all have the same sign when $L^* \subset \theta K'$, and we conclude from our choice of I that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{I} \left|\psi^1_T\right| &= \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{L^*} \left| \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}^+_T:\ L^* \subset \theta T'} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi T'} f \right| = \left| \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}^+_T:\ L^* \subset \theta T'} \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{L^*} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi T'} f \right| \\
&\leq \left| \sum_{K' \in Class_T(1) \cup \mathfrak{C}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T):\ L^* \subset \theta K'} \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{L^*} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi K'} f \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{L^*} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_T} f^+_{fluc} \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{L^*} f^+_{fluc} - \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T f^+_{fluc} \right| \leq 5 \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right| .
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $K' \in Class_T(1) \cup Class_T(2)$, we showed in (2.7) and (2.8) above that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K'} \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_T} f^+_{fluc} \right) \right| \leq (\beta + 10)\, \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right| .$$

Finally, for $K' \in Class_T(3) \equiv \mathfrak{C}^{(\beta)}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K'} \left|\psi^1_T\right| &= \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K'} \left| \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{C}^{(\beta)}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T)} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi T'} f \right| = \left| -\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K'} \left(\triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi K'} f\right) + \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{C}^{(\beta)}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T):\ K' \subset \theta T'} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi T'} f \right| \\
&\geq \left| \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{K'} \left(\triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi K'} f\right) \right| - \left| \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{C}^{(\beta)}_{g^+_{fluc}}(T):\ K' \subset \theta T'} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi T'} f \right| \\
&> (\beta + 5)\, \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right| - 5 \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right| = \beta \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right| .
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\frac{1}{(\beta+10)\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right|} \psi^1_T \in \mathcal{MBF}^{\left(\frac{\beta}{\beta+10}\right)}_{\sigma}(T)$, and the choice $\beta = 20$ gives

$$\frac{1}{30 \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right|} \psi^1_T \in \mathcal{MBF}^{\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}_{\sigma}(T) .$$

Now we define

$$\psi^0_T = \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_T} f^+_{fluc} - \psi^1_T = \sum_{K' \in Class_T(1) \cup Class_T(2)} \triangle^{\sigma}_{\pi K'} f,$$

and note that by the above arguments we have

$$\left\| \psi^0_T \right\|_{\infty} \leq (\beta + 10)\, \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right| = 30 \mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_T \left| f^+_{fluc} \right| ,$$

with the choice $\beta = 20$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{30\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T\left|f^+_{fluc}\right|}f^+_{fluc,T} &= \frac{1}{30\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T\left|f^+_{fluc}\right|}\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_{T^+}}f^+_{fluc}\\ &= \frac{1}{30\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T\left|f^+_{fluc}\right|}\psi^0_T+\frac{1}{30\mathbb{E}^\sigma_T\left|f^+_{fluc}\right|}\psi^1_T\\ &\in L^\infty_T(\sigma)_1+\mathcal{MBF}^{\left(\frac12\right)}_\sigma(T)=\mathcal{RBF}^{\left(\frac12\right)}_\sigma(T),\end{aligned}$$

which proves the second half of (2.3), and this completes the proof of Proposition 5. ☐

The following lemma is also needed in the sequel.

Lemma 10. *Suppose that* $\mathcal{C}_T$ *is a* connected *grid with top interval* $T\subset F$*. If* f *lies in* $\mathcal{BF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$ *(respectively* $\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$*) with* $\gamma>0$*, then the Haar projection* $\frac12\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T}f$ *of* $\frac12 f$ *lies in* $\mathcal{BF}^{\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)}_\sigma(F)$ *(respectively* $\mathcal{RBF}^{\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)}_\sigma(T)$*). If* $\mathcal{C}_T$ *is an* arbitrary *grid with top interval* $T\subset F$*, and* $f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$*, then* $\frac12\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T}f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)}_\sigma(T)$*.*

Proof. We prove the assertion for $\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$, and leave the similar case of $\mathcal{BF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$ to the reader. We may assume that either $f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$ or $f\in(L^\infty_F)_1(\sigma)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the connected hull of the Haar support of f (i.e. the smallest connected grid containing the Haar support of f). In the case that $f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$, let $\mathcal{K}_f$ be the intervals on which f takes a large constant value, while in the case $f\in(L^\infty_F)_1(\sigma)$, let $\mathcal{K}_f=\emptyset$. The function $\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T}f$ is supported in T, and will have constant value greater than γ on any interval $F'\in\mathcal{K}_f$ whose parent $\pi F'$ lies in $\mathcal{C}_T$. Otherwise, if $x\in T$ does *not* lie in such an F', denote by $I_1(x)$ the *smallest* interval I in the connected tree $\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{C}_T$ that contains x, and denote by $I_2(x)$ the *largest* interval in the connected tree $\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{C}_T$ that contains x. Then if $\widetilde{I}_1(x)$ denotes the child of $I_1(x)$ containing x, it is not one of the $F'\in\mathcal{K}_f$, and so we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T}f(x)\right| &= \left|\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{C}_T}\triangle^\sigma_I f(x)\right|=\left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\widetilde{I}_1(x)}f(x)-\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{I_2(x)}f(x)\right|\\ &\le \mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\widetilde{I}_1(x)}|f|+\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{I_2(x)}|f|\le 2.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\frac12\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_T}f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)}_\sigma(T)$ or $(L^\infty_T)_1(\sigma)$. The final assertion for $f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(F)$ follows from the inequality $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\theta K'}\triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'}f<0$, $K'\in\mathcal{K}_f$, itself a consequence of $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'}\triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'}f>\frac{\gamma-1}{2}$ and the fact that $\triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'}f$ has mean zero. ☐

One final observation is in store here, namely that we can always assume γ is as large as we wish in $\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(T)$ at the expense of dividing by a constant C_γ.

Lemma 11. *We have* $\mathcal{RBF}^{(\eta)}_\sigma(T)\subset\frac{1}{4(\gamma+1)}\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(T)$ *for* $0<\eta<\gamma<\infty$*.*

Proof. Let $f\in\mathcal{RBF}^{(\eta)}_\sigma(T)$ with $f=g+h$; $g\in(L^\infty_T)_1(\sigma)$ and $h\in\mathcal{MBF}^{(\eta)}_\sigma(T)$. Then set

$$h_{bdd}=\sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_h:\ \mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'}g\le 2\gamma}\triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'}h\text{ and }h_{fluc}=\sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_h:\ \mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'}g>2\gamma}\triangle^\sigma_{\pi K'}h,$$

to obtain $\frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}h_{bdd} \in (L^\infty_T)_1(\sigma)$ and $\frac{1}{2}h_{fluc} \in \mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(T)$. Then $\frac{1}{4(\gamma+1)}f$ equals $\frac{1}{4(\gamma+1)}(g+h_{bdd})$ plus $\frac{1}{4(\gamma+1)}h_{fluc}$, which is in $\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(T)$. □

3. The energy corona and stopping form

In order to proceed with *interval* size splitting we must first impose an energy corona decomposition as in [**NTV4**] and [**LaSaUr**]. Recall the energy $\mathsf{E}(I,\omega)$ of a measure ω on a dyadic interval I is given by

$$\mathsf{E}(I,\omega)^2 = \frac{1}{|I|_\omega}\int_I \left(\frac{x-\mathbb{E}^\omega_I x}{|I|}\right)^2 d\omega(x) = \frac{1}{|I|_\omega}\sum_{J\subset I}\left|\left\langle \frac{x}{|I|}, h^\omega_J\right\rangle_\omega\right|^2,$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that the Haar functions $\{h^\omega_J\}_{J\subset I}$ form an orthonormal basis of $\left\{f\in L^2(\omega) : \text{supp} f\subset I \text{ and } \int f d\omega = 0\right\}$. Recall also that $J\Subset I$ means $J\subset I$, $|J|\le 2^{-r}|I|$ and that J is good - see Remark 4.

Definition 11. *Given an interval S_0, define $\mathcal{S}(S_0)$ to be the maximal subintervals $I\subset S_0$ such that there is a partition $\mathcal{J}(I)$ of I into good subintervals $J\Subset I$ with*

$$\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(I)} |J|_\omega \mathsf{E}(J,\omega)^2 \mathrm{P}(J,\mathbf{1}_{S_0}\sigma)^2 \ge 10\mathfrak{E}^2\ |I|_\sigma, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{E}$ is the constant in the energy condition

$$\sum_{I\supset \dot{\bigcup}_i I_i} |I_i|_\omega \mathsf{E}(I_i,\omega)^2 \mathrm{P}(I_i,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma)^2 \le \mathfrak{E}^2\ |I|_\sigma .$$

Then define the σ-energy stopping intervals of S_0 to be the collection $\mathcal{S}=\bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \mathcal{S}_n$ where $\mathcal{S}_0=\mathcal{S}(S_0)$ and $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}=\bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}_n}\mathcal{S}(S)$ for $n\ge 0$.

From the energy condition we obtain the σ-Carleson estimate

$$\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}:\ S\subset I} |S|_\sigma \le 2|I|_\sigma, \qquad I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma. \tag{3.2}$$

We emphasize that this collection of stopping times depends only on S_0 and the weight pair (σ,ω), and not on any functions at hand. There is also a dual definition of energy stopping times $\mathcal{T}$ that satisfies an ω-Carleson estimate

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}:\ T\subset J} |T|_\omega \le 2|J|_\omega, \qquad J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega. \tag{3.3}$$

Finally, we record the reason for introducing energy stopping times. If

$$X(\mathcal{C}_S)^2 \equiv \sup_{I\in\mathcal{C}_S}\frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\sup_{\text{partitions } \mathcal{J}(I) \text{ of } I}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(I)} |J|_\omega \mathsf{E}(J,\omega)^2 \mathrm{P}(J,\mathbf{1}_S\sigma)^2 \tag{3.4}$$

is (the square of) the *stopping energy* of the weight pair (σ,ω) with respect to the corona $\mathcal{C}_S$, then we have the *stopping energy bounds*

$$X(\mathcal{C}_S) \le \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{E}, \qquad S\in\mathcal{S}. \tag{3.5}$$

Later we will introduce refinements of the stopping energy that depend as well on the Haar supports of the functions $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g\in L^2(\omega)$ at hand.

4. The parallel triple corona decomposition

Here is our triple corona decomposition of $f \in L^2(\sigma)$. We first apply the Calderón-Zygmund corona decomposition to the function $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ obtain

$$f = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f.$$

Then we apply part (1) of Proposition 5 to write

$$\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f = \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f\right)_{bdd} + \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f\right)^{+}_{fluc} + \left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f\right)^{-}_{fluc},$$

where $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f\right)_{bdd}$ is a prebounded function on F and $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f\right)^{\pm}_{fluc}$ is a prefluctuation$^{\pm}$ function on F. So as not to further clutter notation we will drop this distinction, and simply write $\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f$ with the understanding that $\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f$ represents $\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|$ times either a prebounded or prefluctuation function on F.

We then iterate with a second Calderón-Zygmund corona decomposition as in part (2) of Proposition 5, and use Lemma 11 to ensure that the minimal bounded fluctuation functions have γ large. Lemma 1 on iterating coronas then gives us stopping times $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ and stopping data $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})}(K)$ for f, along with the *double corona decomposition*

$$f = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_K} f. \tag{4.1}$$

Keeping in mind our understanding regarding $\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f$ above, we have the following estimate for $\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_K} f$ where we define $F_K \in \mathcal{F}$ to be the unique stopping interval in $\mathcal{F}$ for which $K \in \mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F$ (recall we have arranged for γ to be large at the expense of increasing the constant C_γ below).

Lemma 12. *For $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ and F_K such that $K \in \mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F_K}$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{C_\gamma\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_K \left|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F_K}} f\right|\right)} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_K} f \in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K).$$

Proof. Let $F = F_K$. By Lemma 8, we have

$$h \equiv \frac{1}{(C_0\gamma + \gamma + 1)\,\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_F |f|} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f \in \mathcal{BF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(F), \tag{4.2}$$

and then by Proposition 5 and Lemma 11, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{5\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_K \left|\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f\right|} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_K} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} f &= \frac{1}{5\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_K |h|} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_K} h \\ &\in \mathcal{RBF}^{\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}_{\sigma}(K) \subset 4(\gamma+1)\,\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(K). \end{aligned}$$

□

We then finish our triple corona decomposition of f in (4.1) as follows. For each fixed $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$, construct the *energy* corona decomposition $\{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_S\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}(K)}$

corresponding to the weight pair (σ,ω) with top interval $S_0 = K$, as given in Definition 11. Recall from Lemma 12 that

$$h_K \equiv \frac{1}{C_\gamma\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_K \left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_K}} f\right|\right)} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K} f \in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma (K).$$

We now modify $\mathcal{S}(K)$ by adding the intervals $K' \in \mathcal{K}_{h_K}$ to $\mathcal{S}(K)$ and removing from $\mathcal{S}(K)$ all the intervals S that are strictly contained in some $K' \in \mathcal{K}_{h_K}$. We denote this modified collection by $\mathcal{S}'(K)$. Of course, if $h_K \in (L^\infty_K)_1(\sigma)$, then $\mathcal{K}_{h_K} = \emptyset$ and no modification is made, so that $\mathcal{S}'(K) = \mathcal{S}(K)$.

We then define stopping data $\left\{\alpha_{\mathcal{S}'(K)}(S)\right\}_{S\in\mathcal{S}'(K)}$ for the function $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K} f$ relative to the modified stopping times $\mathcal{S}'(K)$ as follows. For $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ define

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{S}'(K)}(S) = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} 2\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K) & \text{for} & S \in \mathcal{S}'(K) \setminus \mathcal{K}_{h_K} \\ \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K') & \text{for} & S \in \mathcal{K}_{h_K} \end{array} \right. .$$

Then properties (2) and (4) of Definition 1 are immediate. Property (1) follows since if $I \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}}_K$, then

$$\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I \left|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}}_K} f\right| \leq 2\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I \left|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{F}}_{F_K}} f\right| \leq 2\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F_K) \leq 2\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K).$$

Property (3) follows because (3.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}'(K)} \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'(K)}(S)^2 |S|_\sigma &\lesssim \int \left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}'(K)\setminus\mathcal{K}_{h_K}} \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'(K)}(S)\mathbf{1}_S\right)^2 d\sigma + \int \left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{K}_{h_K}} \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'(K)}(S)\mathbf{1}_S\right)^2 d\sigma \\
&= \sum_{S,S'\in\mathcal{S}(K)\setminus\mathcal{K}_{h_K}} 4\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)^2 |S\cap S'|_\sigma + \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_{h_K}} \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K')^2 |K'|_\sigma \\
&\leq 8\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)^2 \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(K)} \sum_{\substack{S'\in\mathcal{S}(K)\\ S'\subset S}} |S\cap S'|_\sigma + \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_{h_K}} \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K')^2 |K'|_\sigma \\
&\leq 16\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)^2 \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(K)} |S|_\sigma + \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_{h_K}} \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K')^2 |K'|_\sigma \\
&\leq 16\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K)^2 |K|_\sigma + \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}_{h_K}} \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}(K')^2 |K'|_\sigma \lesssim \left\|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}}_K} f\right\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}.
\end{aligned}$$

At this point we write $\mathcal{S}(K)$ in place of $\mathcal{S}'(K)$ and apply Lemma 1 to obtain iterated stopping times $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))$ and iterated stopping data $\left\{\alpha_{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))}(S)\right\}_{S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))}$. This gives us the following *triple corona decomposition* of f,

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_F} f = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(F)} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_F} f = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(F)} \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(K)} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_F} f \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})} \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(K)} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S\cap\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K} f = \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S} f,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

as well as a corresponding triple corona decomposition of g,

$$\begin{aligned}
g &= \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_G} g = \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}(G)} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_L} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_G} g = \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}(G)} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}(L)} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_L} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_G} g \\
&= \sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}(L)} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T\cap\mathcal{C}^\omega_L} g = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}))} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T} g.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

We emphasize that the energy coronas $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are independent of each other, in contrast to the usual constructions in [**NTV4**] and [**LaSaUr**], where $\mathcal{T}$ is derived from $\mathcal{S}$. Using Lemma 10, we have the following extension of Lemma 12.

LEMMA 13. *For $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}))$, and with corresponding K, F and L, G as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{C_\gamma\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_K\left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_K}} f\right|\right)}\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S\cap\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K} f &\in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(S),\\
\frac{1}{C_\gamma\left(\mathbb{E}^\omega_L\left|\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_{G_L}} g\right|\right)}\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T\cap\mathcal{C}^\omega_L} g &\in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\omega(T).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we apply the *parallel* corona decomposition as in (0.6) corresponding to the triple corona decompositions (4.3) and (4.4). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle H_\sigma f, g\rangle_\omega &= \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}}\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}}\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}}\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S}\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K}\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_F} f\right), \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T}\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_L}\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_G} g\right\rangle_\omega\\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})}\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})}\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}}\left\langle H_\sigma\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S\cap\mathcal{C}^\sigma_K} f, \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T\cap\mathcal{C}^\omega_L} g\right\rangle_\omega\\
&\equiv \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}}\sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}}\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f\right), \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_B} g\right\rangle_\omega\\
&= \mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g) + \mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g) + \mathsf{H}_{far}(f,g),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})) \text{ and } \mathcal{B} \equiv \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}))$$

are the triple stopping collections for f and g respectively. We are relabeling the triple coronas as $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ here so as to minimize confusion when we apply the various different estimates associated with each of the three corona decompositions of f and g. We now record the two main facts proved above.

LEMMA 14. *The data $\mathcal{A}$ and $\{\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(A)\}_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ satisfy properties (1), (2), (3) and (4) in Definition 1, and similarly for the data $\mathcal{B}$ and $\{\beta_{\mathcal{B}}(B)\}_{B\in\mathcal{B}}$. Moreover, we have the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{C_\gamma\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(A)}\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f &\in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(A),\\
\frac{1}{C_\gamma\beta_{\mathcal{B}}(B)}\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_B} g &\in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\omega(B),
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant C_γ depends only on $\gamma > 0$, which can be taken as large as we wish.

Thus we can apply the Iterated Corona Proposition 1 to the parallel triple corona decomposition (0.6):

$$\langle H_\sigma f, g\rangle_\omega = \mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g) + \mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g) + \mathsf{H}_{far}(f,g).$$

The result is that

$$|\mathsf{H}_{far}(f,g)| \lesssim (\mathfrak{NTV})\,\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\,\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}.$$

Moreover, Lemma 2 implies

$$|\mathsf{H}_{disjoint}(f,g)| \lesssim (\mathfrak{NTV})\,\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\,\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},$$

and so it remains to deal only with the near form $\mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g)$.

We first further decompose $\mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g)$ into lower and upper parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{H}_{near}(f,g) &= \left\{ \sum_{\substack{(A,B)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})\\ B\subset A}} + \sum_{\substack{(A,B)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})\\ A\subset B}} \right\} \int H_\sigma\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_A} f\right)\ \left(\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_B} g\right)\omega \\
&= \mathsf{H}_{near\ lower}(f,g) + \mathsf{H}_{near\ upper}(f,g)\,; \\
\mathsf{H}_{near\ lower}(f,g) &= \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}} \left\langle H_\sigma \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f, \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A} g\right\rangle_\omega ; \\
\mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A} &\equiv \sum_{J\in\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_A} \triangle^\omega_J \text{ where } \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A \equiv \bigcup_{\substack{B\in\mathcal{B}:\ B\subset A\\ (A,B)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})}} \mathcal{C}^\omega_B .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have that $\mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_A} = \sum_{\substack{B\in\mathcal{B}:\ B\subset A\\ (A,B)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})}} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}_B}$ is the projection onto all of the coronas $\mathcal{C}^\omega_B$ for which B is 'near and below' A. By symmetry, it suffices to consider the lower near form $\mathsf{H}_{near\ lower}(f,g)$.

4.1. Reduction to restricted bounded fluctuation. By Lemma 10, the function $\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f$ is an appropriate multiple of a function in $\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(A)$. More precisely, if $A = S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))$ and K_S is the unique interval $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying $S \in \mathcal{S}(K)$, then $\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f = \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S \cap \mathcal{C}^\sigma_{K_S}} f$ and

$$f_S \equiv \frac{1}{C_\gamma\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K_S}\left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_{K_S}}} f\right|\right)} \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S\cap\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{K_S}} f \in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(S)\,.$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(S)$, we can write

$$\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S\cap\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{K_S}} f = \varphi_S + \psi_S$$

where

$$\frac{1}{C_\gamma\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_K\left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_{K_S}}} f\right|\right)} \varphi_S \in \left(L^\infty_S\right)_1(\sigma)\,, \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{C_\gamma\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_K\left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_{K_S}}} f\right|\right)} \psi_S \in \mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(S)\,. \tag{4.6}$$

We now apply, and **for the only time in this paper**, the first of the indicator/interval testing conditions in (0.4) to obtain

$$\left|\left\langle H_\sigma \varphi_S, \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_S} g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \leq \mathfrak{T}_{ind} 5\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_K\left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_{K_S}}} f\right|\right)\sqrt{|S|_\sigma}\left\|\mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_S} g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} . \tag{4.7}$$

If we can also show that

(4.8)

$$\left|\left\langle H_\sigma \psi_S, \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_S} g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}\left\{\left\|\psi_S\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} + 5\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_K\left|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_{K_S}}} f\right|\right)\sqrt{|S|_\sigma}\right\}\left\|\mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_S} g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} ,$$

it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\left\langle H_\sigma \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f, \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A} g \right\rangle_\omega\right| = \left|\left\langle H_\sigma \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S \cap \mathcal{C}^\sigma_{K_S}} f, \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A} g \right\rangle_\omega\right| \\ \lesssim \quad & \mathfrak{NTV}_{ind} \left\{ \left\| \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_S \cap \mathcal{C}^\sigma_{K_S}} \right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} + 5 \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_K \left| \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_{F_{K_S}}} f \right| \right) \sqrt{|S|_\sigma} \right\} \left\| \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_S} g \right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ \approx \quad & \mathfrak{NTV}_{ind} \left\{ \left\| \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f \right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} + \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(A) \sqrt{|A|_\sigma} \right\} \left\| \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A} g \right\|_{L^2(\omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\mathsf{H}_{near\ lower}(f,g)\right| \leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left|\left\langle H_\sigma \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f, \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A} g \right\rangle_\omega\right| \\ \lesssim \quad & \mathfrak{NTV}_{ind} \left(\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \left\| \mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\sigma_A} f \right\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)} + \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(A)^2 |A|_\sigma \right\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left\| \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^\omega_A} g \right\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \lesssim \quad & \mathfrak{NTV}_{ind} \ \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have proved the following reduction of the two weight inequality for the Hilbert transform to testing restricted bounded fluctuation functions in (4.8).

In order to state the inequality precisely, we need two definitions. First, we introduce a refinement of the stopping energy in (3.4) that depends as well on functions f and g.

Definition 12. *Given $g \in L^2(\omega)$, define the g-energy $\mathsf{E}_g(J,\omega)$ of an interval J by*

$$\mathsf{E}_g(J,\omega)^2 \equiv \mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}(J,\omega)^2 = \frac{1}{|J|_\omega} \sum_{J' \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \left\langle \frac{x}{|J|}, h^\omega_{J'} \right\rangle_\omega \right|^2,$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is the Haar support of g and $\mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is defined in (2.2). For an interval I, let $\mathcal{J}_g(I)$ consist of the maximal *intervals J in $\mathcal{G}$ that satisfy $J \Subset I$. Then given $f \in L^2_S(\sigma)$ and $g \in L^2_S(\omega)$, define the* stopping energy *$\boldsymbol{X}^S(f,g)$ of the pair (f,g) on S by*

$$\boldsymbol{X}^S(f,g)^2 = \sup_{I \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_g(I)} |J|_\omega \, \mathsf{E}_g(J,\omega)^2 \, \mathrm{P}\left(J, \mathbf{1}_{S \setminus I} \sigma\right)^2. \tag{4.9}$$

Second, we introduce a subspace $\widetilde{L}^2_A(\omega)$ of $L^2_A(\omega)$ that has a small amount of structure relative to the interval A, and which will play a role in reducing to stopping forms below.

Definition 13. *Define $g \in \widetilde{L}^2_A(\omega)$ if*

$$g = \mathsf{Q}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_{\widetilde{A}}} g = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}:\ B \sim A} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_B} g \ , \quad \mathcal{C}^\omega_{\widetilde{A}} \equiv \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}:\ B \sim A} \mathcal{C}^\omega_B \ ,$$

where the coronas $\{\mathcal{C}^\omega_B\}_{B \in \mathcal{B}:\ B \sim A}$ are as above, satisfy an ω-Carleson condition, and

$$\frac{1}{C_\gamma \left(\mathbb{E}^\omega_{L_T} \left| \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_{G_{L_T}}} g \right| \right)} \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T \cap \mathcal{C}^\omega_{L_T}} g \in \mathcal{RBF}^{(\gamma)}_\omega(T),$$

where $B = T$, $\mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_B} g = \mathsf{P}^\omega_{\mathcal{C}^\omega_T \cap \mathcal{C}^\omega_{L_T}} g$.

Here is the reduction we have proved above.

LEMMA 15. *The two weight Hilbert transform inequality (0.2) is implied by the following minimal bilinear inequality with best constant* $\mathfrak{M}$*, and its dual inequality with best constant* $\mathfrak{M}^*$*:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\left\langle H_\sigma f, g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \lesssim \mathfrak{M}\left(\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}+\sqrt{|A|_\sigma}\right)\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\,, \\ &\textit{for } f \in \mathcal{MBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(A)\,,\ g \in \widetilde{L}_A^2(\omega) \ \textit{ and } \boldsymbol{X}^A(f,g) \leq \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

The occurrence of $f \in \mathcal{MBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(A)$ in (4.10) as a minimal bounded fluctuation function is the best that can be hoped for regarding f. But we still have two problems with $g \in \widetilde{L}_A^2(\omega)$: first, that g is an *unbounded sum* of restricted bounded fluctuation functions; and second, that these summands are *not* minimal bounded fluctuation, just restricted.

CHAPTER 6

Interval size splitting

It remains to estimate $\left\langle H_{\sigma}f,g\right\rangle_{\omega}$ in (4.10) for $f\in\mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}\left(A\right)$ and $g\in\widetilde{L}_{A}^{2}\left(\omega\right)$. For this we will finally resort to the original interval size splitting of Nazarov, Treil and Volberg. We will expand the functions f and g in their Haar decompositions over $I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}$ and $J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ respectively, and then apply the NTV splitting according to the relative length of the intervals, $\left|J\right|<\left|I\right|$ or $\left|I\right|<\left|J\right|$. The key advantages we have that permit this splitting to work in the current situation are that

1. The function f lies in $\mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}\left(A\right)$, and the function $g=\sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}:\ B\sim A}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{B}^{\omega}}^{\omega}g$ lies in $\widetilde{L}_{A}^{2}\left(\omega\right)$;
2. We have a stopping energy bound,

$$\boldsymbol{X}\left(f,g\right)\leq\sqrt{10}\mathfrak{E}\equiv C_{\boldsymbol{X}}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}}+\mathfrak{T}, \tag{0.11}$$

   where $\boldsymbol{X}\left(f,g\right)$ is the *stopping energy* as defined in (4.9) below.
3. There is also a dual stopping energy bound

$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\prime}\left(f_{B},g_{B}\right)\leq C_{\boldsymbol{X}}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}}+\mathfrak{T}, \tag{0.12}$$

   for the corona decomposition $\left\{\mathcal{C}_{B}^{\omega}\right\}_{B\in\mathcal{B}}$, where f_{B},g_{B} are defined below.

The boundedness of the form

$$\mathsf{B}^{A}\left(f,g\right)\equiv\left\langle H_{\sigma}f,g\right\rangle_{\omega}$$

in (4.10) is implied by boundedness of each of the split forms $\mathsf{B}_{\Subset}\left(f,g\right)$ and $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset}\left(f,g\right)$ introduced in [**LaSaShUr**],

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{B}_{\Subset}^{A}\left(f,g\right) &= \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\left(\mathcal{C}_{A}^{\sigma}\cap\mathcal{C}_{\widetilde{A}}^{\omega}\right)\times\mathcal{C}_{\widetilde{A}}^{\omega}\\ J\Subset I}}\left\langle H_{\sigma}\bigtriangleup_{I}^{\sigma}f,\bigtriangleup_{J}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega},\\ \mathsf{B}_{\Supset}^{A}\left(f,g\right) &= \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\left(\mathcal{C}_{A}^{\sigma}\cap\mathcal{C}_{\widetilde{A}}^{\omega}\right)\times\mathcal{C}_{\widetilde{A}}^{\omega}\\ I\Subset J}}\left\langle\bigtriangleup_{I}^{\sigma}f,H_{\omega}\bigtriangleup_{J}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\sigma},\end{aligned}$$

where the presence of the superscript A in the forms $\mathsf{B}^{A}\left(f,g\right)$, $\mathsf{B}_{\Subset}^{A}\left(f,g\right)$ and $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset}^{A}\left(f,g\right)$ indicates that f and g are as in (4.10), and $\mathcal{C}_{\widetilde{A}}^{\omega}$ is defined in Definition 13.

Now the function 'on top' in the form $\mathsf{B}_{\Subset}^{A}\left(f,g\right)$, namely f, has the special property of belonging to $\mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}\left(A\right)$. The function 'on bottom' in the form, namely g, lies in the broader space $\widetilde{L}_{A}^{2}\left(\omega\right)$, so in particular in $L_{A}^{2}\left(\omega\right)$, and the pair satisfies the stopping energy bound in (0.11). We say that such a form is of type $\mathcal{MBF}/L^{2}$, reflecting the fact that the top function is $\mathcal{MBF}$ and the bottom function is L^{2}. However, the 'top' function in the form $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset}^{A}\left(f,g\right)$, namely g, fails to be $\mathcal{MBF}$, rather it is a sum of such, and so $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset}^{A}\left(f,g\right)$ is *not* a form of type $\mathcal{MBF}/L^{2}$. Before we can proceed with an application of the NTV method, we must further reduce the boundedness of the form $\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset}(f,g)$ to that of simpler forms. Recall that $g = \sum_{B\sim A}\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}g$, and write

$$\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset}(f,g) = \sum_{B\sim A}\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\left(\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_A\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{A}}\right)\times\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{A}}\\ I\Subset J}}\left\langle\bigtriangleup^{\sigma}_I f, H_{\omega}\bigtriangleup^{\omega}_J\left(\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}g\right)\right\rangle_{\sigma}.$$

We claim that boundedness in (4.10), modulo $(\mathcal{NTV})\,\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}$, of the form $\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset}$ is implied by boundedness in (4.10) of the local form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset,\ local}(f,g) &\equiv \sum_{B\sim A}\alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B)\,\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset,B}(f_B,g_B);\\
\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset,B}(f_B,g_B) &\equiv \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in(\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_A\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B)\times\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B\\ I\Subset J}}\langle\bigtriangleup^{\sigma}_I f_B, H_{\omega}\bigtriangleup^{\omega}_J g_B\rangle_{\sigma},\\
f_B &= \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_A\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}f,\qquad g_B = \frac{1}{\alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B)}\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}g.
\end{aligned}$$

The key point here is that the difference of the forms in question is given by
(0.13)

$$\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset}(f,g) - \mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset,\ local}(f,g) = \sum_{B\sim A}\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\left(\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_A\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{A}}\right)\times\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B\\ I\Subset B'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{B}}(B)}}\langle\bigtriangleup^{\sigma}_I f, H_{\omega}\bigtriangleup^{\omega}_J g\rangle_{\sigma} = \mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g),$$

and so the estimate for $\mathsf{B}_{mix}(f,g)$ in Proposition 2 applies to prove our claim. Altogether we have shown that (4.10) will follow from the two inequalities,

$$\begin{gathered}
\left|\mathsf{B}^A_{\Subset}(f,g)\right| \lesssim \mathfrak{M}\left(\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} + \sqrt{|A|_{\sigma}}\right)\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},\\
\text{for } f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(A),\ g\in\widetilde{L}^2_A(\omega)\ \text{ and } \boldsymbol{X}^A(f,g)\leq\sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C},
\end{gathered}$$

and

$$\begin{gathered}
\left|\sum_{B\sim A}\alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B)\,\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset,B}(f_B,g_B)\right| \lesssim \mathfrak{M}\left(\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} + \sqrt{|A|_{\sigma}}\right)\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},\\
\text{for } f\in\mathcal{MBF}^{(\gamma)}_{\sigma}(A),\ g\in\widetilde{L}^2_A(\omega)\ \text{ and } \boldsymbol{X}^A(f,g)\leq\sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C},\\
f_B = \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_A\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}f,\qquad g_B = \frac{1}{\alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B)}\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}g.
\end{gathered}$$

Moreover, the second inequality will follow from Cauchy-Schwarz and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset,B}(f_B,g_B)\right| \lesssim \mathfrak{M}\,\|f_B\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left(\|g_B\|_{L^2(\omega)} + \sqrt{|B|_{\omega}}\right),\\
f_B &\in \mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}(B),\ g_B\in\mathcal{RBF}_{\omega}(B),\ \boldsymbol{X}^B(f,g)\leq\sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C}\text{ and }\left(\boldsymbol{X}^B\right)'(f,g)\leq\sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now each form $\mathsf{B}^A_{\Supset,B}(f_B,g_B)$ has its 'top' function $g_B = \frac{1}{\alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B)}\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}g$ in $\mathcal{RBF}_{\omega}(B)$, and its 'bottom' function $f_B = \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_A\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B}f$ in $\mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}(B)$, and finally the pair satisfies the stopping energy bound in (0.12). We say that such a form is of type $\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}$.

Thus we have reduced matters to bounding forms of type $\mathcal{MBF}/L^2$ and $\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}$. Note that in both inequalities, the lower function has only its L^2 norm appearing on the right hand side, without the measure of its supporting set.

1. Reduction to stopping forms

Now the boundedness of $\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,B}$ reduces to boundedness of the three terms B_1, B_2 and B_3 on page 11 of [**LaSaShUr**]. Here the term B_2 is controlled by the NTV constant $\mathfrak{NTV}$, term B_1 is controlled by the functional energy constant $\mathfrak{F}$, which by the Functional Energy Proposition 4 in this paper is controlled by $\mathfrak{NTV}$, and finally where the term B_3 is the form,

$$B_3\left(f,g\right) \equiv \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J:\ J\Subset I \text{ and } I_J=I_{big}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^{\sigma} \bigtriangleup_I^{\sigma} f\right) \ \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{I_J}, \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g\right\rangle_{\omega},$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ is the Haar support of f. We are here considering the case $I_J = I_{big}$, because when $I_J = I_{small}$, we can simply use that the I_J are pairwise disjoint. Note that here f is, when appropriately normalized, a minimal bounded fluctuation function on A, while $g = \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_A^{\omega}}^{\omega} g$ is in $\widetilde{L}_A^2\left(\omega\right)$, and because of the restriction $J \Subset I$ and $I_J = I_{big}$, the function g lies 'underneath' f.

In similar fashion, the boundedness of the form $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,B}$ reduces to

$$B_3'\left(f_B,g_B\right) \equiv \sum_{J\in\mathcal{G}\cap\mathcal{C}_B^{\omega}} \sum_{I:\ I\Subset J \text{ and } J_I=J_{big}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{J_I}^{\omega} \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g_B\right) \ \left\langle \bigtriangleup_I^{\sigma} f_B^{\maltese}, H_\omega \mathbf{1}_{J_I}\right\rangle_{\sigma},$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is the Haar support of g. Note that here $g_B = \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_B^{\omega}}^{\omega} g$ is, when appropriately normalized, a restricted bounded fluctuation function on B, while $f_B = \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_A^{\sigma}\cap\mathcal{C}_B^{\omega}}^{\sigma} f$ is, when appropriately normalized, a minimal bounded fluctuation function on B, and because of the restriction $I \Subset J$ and $J_I = J_{big}$, the function f_B lies 'underneath' g_B.

We now use the 'paraproduct' trick of NTV, namely that boundedness of $B_3\left(f,g\right)$ is equivalent to boundedness of the stopping form

$$\mathsf{B}_{stop}\left(f,g\right) \equiv \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J:\ J\Subset I \text{ and } I_J=I_{big}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^{\sigma} \bigtriangleup_I^{\sigma} f\right) \ \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{S\setminus I_J}, \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g\right\rangle_{\omega},$$

and similarly, that boundedness of $B_3'\left(f_B,g_B\right)$ is equivalent to boundedness of the stopping form $\mathsf{B}_{stop}'\left(f_B,g_B\right)$. Thus we must bound the stopping form $\mathsf{B}_{stop}\left(f,g\right)$ in two cases, $\mathcal{MBF}/L^2$ and $\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}$.

We emphasize that the Functional Energy condition defined in [**LaSaShUr**] uses Calderón-Zygmund stopping intervals to separate pairs of intervals, and is consequently *identical* to the Functional Energy condition (2.1) defined here.

The above considerations have reduced the two weight inequality (0.2) for the Hilbert transform to the following two inequalities involving the highly nonlinear form B_{stop}.

LEMMA 16. *The two weight Hilbert transform inequality (0.2) is implied by the following nonlinear inequalities with best constants* $\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{MBF}/L^2}$ *and* $\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}}$*:*

$$\left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}\left(f,g\right)\right| \lesssim \mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{MBF}/L^2}\left(\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)} + \sqrt{\left|A\right|_{\sigma}}\right)\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\textit{for } f \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}\left(A\right),\ g \in \widetilde{L}_A^2\left(\omega\right) \ \textit{ and } \boldsymbol{X}^A\left(f,g\right) \leq \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C},$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
(1.2)\,|\mathsf{B}_{stop}(f,g)| &\lesssim \mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}} \left(\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} + \sqrt{|A|_\sigma}\right)\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\,,\\
\text{for } f &\in \mathcal{RBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(A)\,,\ g \in \mathcal{MBF}_\omega^{(\gamma)}(A) \ \text{ and } \boldsymbol{X}^A(f,g) \leq \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C},
\end{aligned}
$$

along with their 'dual' formulations with best constants $\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{MBF}/L^2\ *}$ *and* $\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}\ *}$.

Note again that as observed above, the lower function g has only its $L^2(\omega)$ norm appearing on the right hand side. The first inequality (1.1) is taken up in the next subsection. The second inequality then follows almost immediately, and is treated in the final subsection.

2. Boundedness of the $\mathcal{MBF}/L^2$ stopping form

We show that $\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{MBF}/L^2}$ is controlled by the NTV constant $\mathfrak{NTV}$.

Proposition 6. *Let σ and ω be locally finite positive Borel measures on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ with no common point masses. Then*

$$\mathfrak{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{MBF}/L^2} \lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}.$$

Proof: Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ denote the Haar supports of $f \in \mathcal{MBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(A)$ and $g \in \widetilde{L}_A^2(\omega)$ respectively. Define

$$\mathcal{P}(f,g) \equiv \{(I,J) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} : J \Subset I \text{ and } I_J = I_{big}\}.$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{B}_{stop}(f,g) &\equiv \sum_{I \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{J:\ J \Subset I \text{ and } I_J = I_{big}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f\right) \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{S \setminus I_J}, \triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega \\
&= \sum_{(I,J) \in \mathcal{P}(f,g)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f\right) \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{S \setminus I_J}, \triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega .
\end{aligned}
$$

Given a subset $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathcal{P}(f,g)$ we define

$$\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}(f,g) \equiv \sum_{(I,J) \in \mathcal{P}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f\right) \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{S \setminus I_J}, \triangle_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}) \equiv \sup_{I_1:\ I_1 \subset A} \left(\sum_{\substack{I:\ \text{there is } (I,J) \in \mathcal{P} \\ J \subset I_1 \subset I}} \mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f \right).$$

Clearly we have $\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}) \leq 1$ since $f \in \mathcal{MBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(A)$.

Here is the main lemma.

Lemma 17. *Given $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{P}(f,g)$, there are subsets $\mathcal{P}_{big}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{small}$ of $\mathcal{P}$ such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P} &= \mathcal{P}_{big} \,\dot{\cup}\, \mathcal{P}_{small}\ ,\\
\left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}_{big}}(f,g)\right| &\lesssim (\mathfrak{NTV})\ \mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P})\ \sqrt{|A|_\sigma}\ \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\,,\\
\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}_{small}) &\leq \frac{3}{4}\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P})\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

This lemma proves Proposition 6 as follows. Apply Lemma 17 to $\mathcal{P}_0 \equiv \mathcal{P}(f,g)$ to obtain $(\mathcal{P}_0)_{big}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_0)_{small}$. Then apply Lemma 17 to $\mathcal{P}_1 \equiv (\mathcal{P}_0)_{small}$ to obtain $(\mathcal{P}_1)_{big}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_1)_{small}$. Continue by induction to define $\mathcal{P}_m \equiv (\mathcal{P}_{m-1})_{small}$ for $m \geq 1$. Then Lemma 17 gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}_m) &= \mathbf{size}((\mathcal{P}_{m-1})_{small}) \leq \frac{3}{4}\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}) \\ &\leq \ldots \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^m \mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}_0) \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^m,\end{aligned}$$

and so also

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{(\mathcal{P}_m)_{big}}(f,g)\right| &\lesssim (\mathfrak{NTV})\ \mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}_m)\ \sqrt{|A|_\sigma}\ \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim (\mathfrak{NTV}) \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^m \sqrt{|A|_\sigma}\ \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{P}(f,g) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{P}_m)_{big}$, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathsf{B}_{stop}(f,g)| &= \left|\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathsf{B}_{stop}^{(\mathcal{P}_m)_{big}}(f,g)\right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{NTV}) \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^m \sqrt{|A|_\sigma}\ \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim (\mathfrak{NTV}) \sqrt{|A|_\sigma}\ \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. (of Lemma 17) The two key properties of $f \in \mathcal{MBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(A)$ that we will use are

$$\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{I:\ J\subset I\subset A} \mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f \leq 1.$$

Consider those intervals I_1 that are maximal subject to the condition,

$$\sum_{\substack{I:\text{ there is }(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}\\ J\subset I_1\subset I}} \mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f \geq \frac{3}{4}\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}),$$

and choose one of them with maximum length. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_1 &\equiv \{(I,J)\in\mathcal{P} : J\subset I_1\subset I\}; \\ \mathcal{P}_1 &\equiv \mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{R}_1.\end{aligned}$$

If $I_1, \ldots, I_{m-1}$ have been chosen, then consider those intervals I_m that are maximal subject to the condition,

$$\sum_{\substack{I:\text{ there is }(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}_{m-1}\\ J\subset I_m\subset I}} \mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \triangle_I^\sigma f \geq \frac{3}{4}\mathbf{size}(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}),$$

and choose one of them with maximum length. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_m &\equiv \{(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}_{m-1} : J\subset I_m\subset I\}; \\ \mathcal{P}_m &\equiv \mathcal{P}_{m-1}\setminus\mathcal{R}_m.\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the collection of intervals $\{I_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is pairwise disjoint. Indeed, this follows from the choice of parameter $\frac{3}{4}$ in the maximal conditions.

Next, we define

$$\mathcal{P}_{small} \equiv \mathcal{P} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_m \right) ,$$

and we have the inequality

$$\mathbf{size}\left(\mathcal{P}_{small}\right) \leq \frac{3}{4} \mathbf{size}\left(\mathcal{P}\right).$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{R}_m}\left(f,g\right) &= \sum_{(I,J)\in\mathcal{R}_m} \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^{\sigma} \bigtriangleup_I^{\sigma} f\right) \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{S\setminus I_J}, \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g\right\rangle_{\omega} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{I:\ I_m\subset I\subset A} \mathbb{E}_{I_J}^{\sigma} \bigtriangleup_I^{\sigma} f \right) \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{S\setminus I_J}, \sum_{J:\ J\subset I_m} \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g \right\rangle_{\omega} \\ &\leq \left\langle H_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{S\setminus I_J}, \sum_{J:\ J\subset I_m} \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g \right\rangle_{\omega} \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^{\sigma} \bigtriangleup_I^{\sigma} f \geq 0$ and $\sum_{I:\ I_m\subset I\subset A} \mathbb{E}_{I_J}^{\sigma} \bigtriangleup_I^{\sigma} f \leq 1$. From the monotonicity property and the energy bound, it now follows that

$$\left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{R}_m}\left(f,g\right)\right| \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right) \sqrt{\left|I_m\right|_{\sigma}} \ \left\|g_{I_m}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} ,$$

where $g_{I_m} \equiv \sum_{J:\ J\subset I_m} \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g$.

Thus with

$$\mathcal{P}_{big} \equiv \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_m ,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}_{big}}\left(f,g\right)\right| &\lesssim \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{R}_m}\left(f,g\right)\right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right) \sqrt{\left|I_m\right|_{\sigma}} \ \left\|g_{I_m}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left|I_m\right|_{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\|g_{I_m}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right) \sqrt{\left|A\right|_{\sigma}} \left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} , \end{aligned}$$

since the intervals I_m are pairwise disjoint, and the functions $g_{I_m} \equiv \bigtriangleup_J^{\omega} g$ are thus mutually orthogonal. □

3. Boundedness of the $\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}$ stopping form

We have already done all the work needed to bound the $\mathcal{RBF}/\mathcal{MBF}$ stopping form. Indeed, we have proved above the following inequalities for $f \in \mathcal{RBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}\left(A\right)$

and $g \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\omega}^{(\gamma)}(A)$, when we have both the energy stopping bound $\boldsymbol{X}^{A}(f,g) \leq \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C}$ and the dual energy stopping bound $\left(\boldsymbol{X}^{A}\right)'(f,g) \leq \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|H_{\sigma}(f,g)\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}_{ind}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)};\\
\left|H_{\sigma}(f,g)-\left\{\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,A}(f,g)+\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,A}(f,g)\right\}\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)};\\
\left|\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,stop}^{A}(f,g)-\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,A}(f,g)\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)};\\
\left|\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,stop}^{A}(f,g)-\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,A}(f,g)\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)};\\
\left|\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,stop}^{A}(f,g)\right| &\lesssim \mathfrak{NTV}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)};
\end{aligned}$$

where we are writing $\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,stop}^{A}$ for the stopping form corresponding to $\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,A}$, and $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,stop}^{A}$ for the stopping form corresponding to $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,A}$. The crucial final inequality follows from Proposition 6, because in the form $\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,stop}^{A}(f,g)$, it is $g \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\omega}^{(\gamma)}(A)$ that is the function on top. Thus we conclude that for $f \in \mathcal{RBF}_{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}(A)$, $g \in \mathcal{MBF}_{\omega}^{(\gamma)}(A)$, $\boldsymbol{X}^{A}(f,g) \leq \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C}$ and $\left(\boldsymbol{X}^{A}\right)'(f,g) \leq \sqrt{10}\mathfrak{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,stop}^{A}(f,g) &= \mathsf{B}_{\Subset,stop}^{A}(f,g)-\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,A}(f,g)\\
&\quad+\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,A}(f,g)+\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,A}(f,g)-H_{\sigma}(f,g)\\
&\quad+H_{\sigma}(f,g)\\
&\quad-\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,A}(f,g)+\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,stop}^{A}(f,g)\\
&\quad-\mathsf{B}_{\Supset,stop}^{A}(f,g),
\end{aligned}$$

and so $\left|\mathsf{B}_{\Subset,stop}^{A}(f,g)\right|$ is bounded by $C\mathfrak{NTV}_{ind}\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}$.

Part 2

A two weight theorem for α-fractional singular integrals in $\mathbb{R}^n$

In this second part of the paper, we prove the two weight theorem stated in the Preface, together with a generalization to fractional singular integrals. We begin by reviewing some definitions, stating our theorem, and developing the main innovations in this paper, namely the necessity of the $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ conditions, and a specialized Haar basis used to obtain a *Monotonicity Lemma*. Then we adapt to higher dimensions two of the corona decompositions from Part 1, that result in functions of bounded fluctuation in nonlinear forms with stopping energy control. Finally, we adapt the results from Part 1, together with the clever stopping time and recursion arguments of M. Lacey in [**Lac**], to prove the two weight norm inequality for standard fractional singular integrals under the side assumption that the functional energy constants (Definition 18) are finite.

CHAPTER 7

New results for Calderón-Zygmund operators

Consider a kernel function $K(x,y)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the following standard size and smoothness

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|K\left(x,y\right)\right| &\leq C\left|x-y\right|^{-n}, \\
\left|K\left(x,y\right)-K\left(x',y\right)\right| &\leq C\frac{\left|x-x'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\left|x-y\right|^{-n}, \qquad \frac{\left|x-x'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\leq\frac{1}{2}, \\
\left|K\left(x,y\right)-K\left(x,y'\right)\right| &\leq C\frac{\left|y-y'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\left|x-y\right|^{-n}, \qquad \frac{\left|y-y'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\leq\frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{0.1}
$$

Remark 9. *Usually the adjective 'standard' is reserved for a more general smoothness condition involving a Dini function* $\eta\left(t\right)$ *on* $\left(0,1\right)$, *and in the case at hand we are restricting to* $\eta\left(t\right)=t$.

We define a standard Calderón-Zygmund operator associated with such a kernel as follows.

Definition 14. *We say that* T *is a* standard singular integral operator with kernel K *if* T *is a bounded linear operator on* $L^q\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)$ *for some fixed* $1<q<\infty$, *that is*

$$\left\|Tf\right\|_{L^q\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)}\leq C\left\|f\right\|_{L^q\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)}, \qquad f\in L^q\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right), \tag{0.2}$$

if $K(x,y)$ *is defined on* $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n$ *and satisfies (0.1), and if* T *and* K *are related by*

$$Tf(x)=\int K(x,y)f(y)dy, \qquad a.e.\text{-}x\notin supp\ f, \tag{0.3}$$

whenever $f\in L^q\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)$ *has compact support in* $\mathbb{R}^n$. *We say* $K(x,y)$ *is a* standard singular kernel *if it satisfies (0.1).*

We will also consider *generalized* fractional integrals, including the Cauchy integral in the plane. The setup is essentially the same as above but with a fractional variant of the size and smoothness conditions (0.1) on the kernel. Here are the details. Let $0\leq\alpha<n$. Consider a kernel function $K^\alpha(x,y)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the fractional size and smoothness conditions,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|K^\alpha(x,y)\right| &\leq C\left|x-y\right|^{\alpha-n}, \\
\left|K^\alpha(x,y)-K^\alpha\left(x',y\right)\right| &\leq C\frac{\left|x-x'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\left|x-y\right|^{\alpha-n}, \qquad \frac{\left|x-x'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\leq\frac{1}{2}, \\
\left|K^\alpha(x,y)-K^\alpha\left(x,y'\right)\right| &\leq C\frac{\left|y-y'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\left|x-y\right|^{\alpha-n}, \qquad \frac{\left|y-y'\right|}{\left|x-y\right|}\leq\frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{0.4}
$$

Example 1. *The Cauchy integral* C^1 *in the complex plane arises when* $K(x,y)=\frac{1}{x-y}$, $x,y\in\mathbb{C}$. *The fractional size and smoothness condition 0.4 holds with* $n=2$ *and* $\alpha=1$ *in this case.*

Then we define a standard α-fractional Calderón-Zygmund operator associated with such a kernel as follows.

DEFINITION 15. *We say that* T^α *is a* standard α-fractional integral operator with kernel K^α *if* T^α *is a bounded linear operator from some* $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *to some* $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *for some fixed* $1 < p \leq q < \infty$*, that is*

$$\left\|T^\alpha f\right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left\|f\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \qquad f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

if $K^\alpha(x,y)$ *is defined on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ *and satisfies (0.4), and if* T^α *and* K^α *are related by*

$$T^\alpha f(x) = \int K^\alpha(x,y) f(y) dy, \qquad a.e.\text{-}x \notin supp\ f,$$

whenever $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *has compact support in* $\mathbb{R}^n$*. We say* $K^\alpha(x,y)$ *is a* standard α-fractional kernel *if it satisfies (0.4).*

Now we state the general fractional form of the theorem introduced in the preface. For this we need the fractional analogue of the Poisson integral of a measure μ on a cube Q:

$$\mathrm{P}^\alpha(Q,\mu) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left(|Q|^{\frac{1}{n}} + |x - x_Q|\right)^{n+1-\alpha}} d\mu(x).$$

THEOREM 3. *Suppose that* T^α *is a standard* α*-fractional Calderón-Zygmund operator on* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, and that* ω *and* σ *are positive Borel measures on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *without common point masses. Furthermore, we suppose that the functional energy constants* $\mathfrak{F}^\alpha$ *and* $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha,*}$ *defined in Definition 18 below are finite. Set* $T^\alpha_\sigma f = T^\alpha(f\sigma)$ *for any smooth truncation of* T^α_σ*. Then*

(1) *Suppose* $0 \leq \alpha < 1$*. Then the operator* T^α_σ *is bounded from* $L^2(\sigma)$ *to* $L^2(\omega)$*, i.e.*

$$\left\|T^\alpha_\sigma f\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq \mathfrak{N}_\alpha \left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \tag{0.5}$$

uniformly in smooth truncations of T^α*, and moreover*

$$\mathfrak{N}_\alpha \leq C_\alpha \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2 + \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,*}_2} + \mathfrak{T}_\alpha + \mathfrak{T}_{\alpha,*} + \mathfrak{F}^\alpha + \mathfrak{F}^{\alpha,*}\right),$$

provided that

(a) *the two dual* $\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2$ *conditions hold,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^\alpha_2 &\equiv \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}^n} \mathrm{P}^\alpha(Q,\sigma) \frac{|Q|_\omega}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}} < \infty, \\ \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,*}_2 &\equiv \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}^n} \frac{|Q|_\sigma}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}} \mathrm{P}^\alpha(Q,\omega) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

(b) *and the two dual testing conditions hold,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{T}^2_\alpha &\equiv \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}^n} \frac{1}{|Q|_\sigma} \int_Q \left|T^\alpha(\mathbf{1}_Q\sigma)\right|^2 \omega < \infty, \\ \mathfrak{T}^2_{\alpha,*} &\equiv \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}^n} \frac{1}{|Q|_\omega} \int_Q \left|(T^\alpha)^*(\mathbf{1}_Q\omega)\right|^2 \sigma < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

(2) *Conversely, suppose* $\left\{T_j^\alpha\right\}_{j=1}^J$ *is a collection of Calderón-Zygmund operators with standard kernels* $\left\{K_j^\alpha\right\}_{j=1}^J$, *and that there is* $c>0$ *such that for* each *unit vector* $\mathbf{u}$ *there is* j *satisfying*

$$\left|K_j^\alpha\left(x,x+t\mathbf{u}\right)\right| \geq ct^{\alpha-n}, \qquad t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{0.6}$$

Furthermore, assume that each operator T_j^α *is bounded from* $L^2(\sigma)$ *to* $L^2(\omega)$,

$$\left\|T_\sigma^\alpha f\right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq \mathfrak{N}_\alpha \left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}.$$

Then, provided $0\leq\alpha<\frac{n}{2}$, *the two dual fractional* $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ *conditions hold, and moreover,*

$$\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha+\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha,*}} \leq C\mathfrak{N}_\alpha.$$

Remark 10. *Inequality (0.6)* reverses *the size inequality in (0.1) in the direction of the unit vector* $\mathbf{u}$ *for one of the operators* T_j^α.

Remark 11. *The collection consisting of the Hilbert transform kernel* $\frac{1}{x}$ *alone, or the Beurling transform kernel* $\frac{1}{z}$ *alone, is an example of a kernel satisfying (0.6) for* $\alpha=0$.

Remark 12. *The collection of fractional Riesz transform kernels* $\left\{c_j\frac{x_j-y_j}{|x-y|^{n+1-\alpha}}\right\}_{j=1}^n$ *is an example of a collection satisfying (0.6) for* $0\leq\alpha<n$. *The restriction* $\alpha<1$, *which arises even in preliminary estimates, prevents our theorem from applying to the Cauchy transform, whose convolution kernel is*

$$\frac{1}{z}=\frac{1}{x+iy}=\frac{x}{x^2+y^2}-i\frac{y}{x^2+y^2}=R_1^1-iR_2^1.$$

1. Necessity of the $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ conditions

First we recall the necessity of the usual A_2 condition for elliptic operators in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ from [**LaSaUr1**], where this result was proved also for $1<p<\infty$.

Lemma 18. *Suppose that* σ *and* ω *have no point masses in common, and that* $\left\{K_j\right\}_{j=1}^J$ *is a collection of* standard *kernels satisfying the ellipticity condition (0.1). If there are corresponding Calderón-Zygmund operators* T_j *satisfying*

$$\left\|\chi_E T_j(f\sigma)\right\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\omega)} \leq C\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \qquad E=\mathbb{R}^n\setminus supp\ f,$$

for $1\leq j\leq J$, *then the two weight* A_2 *condition holds.*

Now we prove the necessity of the fractional $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ condition when $0\leq\alpha<\frac{n}{2}$, for the α-fractional Riesz vector transform $\mathbf{R}^\alpha$ defined by

$$\mathbf{R}^\alpha\left(f\sigma\right)(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}R_j^\alpha(x,y)f\left(y\right)d\sigma\left(y\right), \qquad K_j^\alpha\left(x,y\right)=\frac{x^j-y^j}{\left|x-y\right|^{n+1-\alpha}},$$

whose kernel $K_j^\alpha(x,y)$ satisfies (0.4) for $0\leq\alpha<n$. Unfortunately, in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$, the restriction $\alpha<1$ just misses including the Cauchy transform $\mathcal{C}$ whose kernel is $K^1(z,w)=\frac{\overline{z-w}}{|z-w|^2}=\frac{1}{z-w}$. Parts of the following argument are taken from unpublished material obtained in joint work with M. Lacey.

Lemma 19. *Let T^{α} be any α-standard fractional kernel satisfying the ellipticity condition (0.6). Then for $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{n}{2}$ we have*

$$\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha} \lesssim \mathfrak{N}_{\alpha}\left(T^{\alpha}\right).$$

Remark 13. *Cancellation properties of T^{α} play no role the proof below. Indeed the proof shows that $\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha}$ is dominated by the best constant C in the restricted inequality*

$$\left\|\chi_E T^{\alpha}(f\sigma)\right\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\omega)} \leq C\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \qquad E = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus supp\ f.$$

Proof. First we give the proof for the case when T^{α} is the α-fractional Riesz transform $\mathbf{R}^{\alpha}$, whose kernel is $\mathbf{K}^{\alpha}(x,y) = \frac{x-y}{|x-y|^{n+1-\alpha}}$. Define the 2^n generalized quadrants $\mathcal{Q}_m$ for $m \in \{-1,1\}^n$, and their translates $\mathcal{Q}_m(w)$ for $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_m &= \left\{(x_1,...,x_n) : m_k x_k > 0\right\}, \\ \mathcal{Q}_m(w) &= \left\{z : z - w \in \mathcal{Q}_m\right\}, \qquad w \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $m \in \{-1,1\}^n$ and a cube I. For $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$ let

$$\begin{aligned} s_I(x) &= \frac{\ell(I)}{\ell(I) + \left|x - \zeta_I\right|}, \\ f_{a,r}(y) &= \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a) \cap B(0,r)}(y)\, s_I(y)^{n-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where ζ_I is the center of the cube I. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(I)\left|x-y\right| &\leq \ell(I)\left|x-\zeta_I\right| + \ell(I)\left|\zeta_I - y\right| \\ &\leq \left[\ell(I) + \left|x-\zeta_I\right|\right]\left[\ell(I) + \left|\zeta_I - y\right|\right] \end{aligned}$$

implies

$$\frac{1}{|x-y|} \geq \frac{1}{\ell(I)} s_I(x)\, s_I(y), \qquad x,y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Now the key observation is that with $L\zeta \equiv m \cdot \zeta$, we have

$$L(x-y) = m \cdot (x-y) \geq |x-y|, \qquad x \in \mathcal{Q}_m(y),$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} L\left(\mathbf{K}^{\alpha}(x,y)\right) &= \frac{L(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n+1-\alpha}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \geq \ell(I)^{\alpha-n}\, s_I(x)^{n-\alpha}\, s_I(y)^{n-\alpha}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

provided $x \in \mathcal{Q}_{+,+}(y)$. Now we note that $x \in \mathcal{Q}_m(y)$ when $x \in \mathcal{Q}_m(a)$ and $y \in \mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)$ to obtain that for $x \in \mathcal{Q}_m(a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} L\left(T^{\alpha}\left(f_{a,r}\sigma\right)(x)\right) &= \int_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)\cap B(0,r)} \frac{L(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n+1-\alpha}} s_I(y)\, d\sigma(y) \\ &\geq \ell(I)^{\alpha-n}\, s_I(x)^{n-\alpha} \int_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)\cap B(0,r)} s_I(y)^{2n-2\alpha}\, d\sigma(y). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $|L\zeta| \leq \sqrt{n}\,|\zeta|$ and our assumed two weight inequality for the fractional Riesz transform, we see that for $r>0$ large,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ell(I)^{2\alpha-2n}\int_{\mathcal{Q}_m(a)} s_I(x)^{2n-2\alpha}\left(\int_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)\cap B(0,r)} s_I(y)^{2n-2\alpha}\,d\sigma(y)\right)^2 d\omega(x)\\
&\leq \|LT(\sigma f_{a,r})\|^2_{L^2(\omega)} \lesssim \mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)^2\,\|f_{a,r}\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)} = \mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)^2\int_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)\cap B(0,r)} s_I(y)^{2n-2\alpha}\,d\sigma(y)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the last inequality, we obtain

$$\ell(I)^{2\alpha-2n}\int_{\mathcal{Q}_m(a)} s_I(x)^{2n-2\alpha}\,d\omega(x)\int_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)\cap B(0,r)} s_I(y)^{2n-2\alpha}\,d\sigma(y) \lesssim \mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)^2\,,$$

and upon letting $r\to\infty$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Q}_m(a)}\frac{\ell(I)^{2-\alpha}}{\left(\ell(I)+|x-\zeta_I|\right)^{4-2\alpha}}d\omega(x)\int_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)}\frac{\ell(I)^{2-\alpha}}{\left(\ell(I)+|y-\zeta_I|\right)^{4-2\alpha}}d\sigma(y) \lesssim \mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)^2\,.$$

Note that the ranges of integration above are pairs of opposing generalized quadrants.

Now we can prove the half-strengthened $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ condition. Fix a cube Q, which without loss of generality can be taken to be centered at the origin, $\zeta_Q=0$. Then choose $a=(2\ell(Q),2\ell(Q))$ and $I=Q$ so that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{\mathcal{Q}_m(a)}\frac{\ell(Q)^{n-\alpha}}{\left(\ell(Q)+|z|\right)^{2n-2\alpha}}d\omega(z)\right)\left(\ell(Q)^{\alpha-n}\int_Q d\sigma\right)\\
\leq\;\; & C_\alpha\int_{\mathcal{Q}_m(a)}\frac{\ell(Q)^{n-\alpha}}{\left(\ell(Q)+|z|\right)^{2n-2\alpha}}d\omega(z)\int_{\mathcal{Q}_{-m}(a)}\frac{\ell(Q)^{n-\alpha}}{\left(\ell(Q)+|z|\right)^{2n-2\alpha}}d\sigma(w) \lesssim \mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)^2\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Now fix $m=(1,1,...,1)$ and note that there is a fixed N (independent of $\ell(Q)$) and a fixed collection of rotations $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^N$, such that the rotates $\rho_k\mathcal{Q}_m(a)$, $1\leq k\leq N$, of the generalized quadrant $\mathcal{Q}_m(a)$ cover the complement of the ball $B(0,4\sqrt{n}\ell(Q))$:

$$B\left(0,4\sqrt{n}\ell(Q)\right)^c\subset\bigcup_{k=1}^N\rho_k\mathcal{Q}_m(a)\,.$$

Then we obtain, upon applying the same argument to these rotated pairs of generalized quadrants,

(1.2)
$$\left(\int_{B\left(0,4\sqrt{n}\ell(Q)\right)^c}\frac{\ell(Q)^{n-\alpha}}{\left(\ell(Q)+|x|\right)^{2n-2\alpha}}d\omega(x)\right)\left(\ell(Q)^{\alpha-n}\int_Q d\sigma\right)\lesssim\mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)^2\,.$$

Finally, for $0\leq\alpha<1$, the usual A_2^α condition is implied by the norm inequality, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
A_2^\alpha &\equiv \sup_{Q'}\ell(Q')^\alpha\left(\frac{1}{|Q'|}\int_{Q'}d\omega\right)^{\frac12}\left(\frac{1}{|Q'|}\int_{Q'}d\sigma\right)^{\frac12}\lesssim\mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)\,;\\
\text{i.e. } &\left(\int_{Q'}d\omega\right)\left(\int_{Q'}d\sigma\right)\lesssim\mathfrak{N}_\gamma(\mathbf{R}^\gamma)^2\,|Q'|^{2-\frac{2\alpha}{n}}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

upon invoking the argument used to prove Lemma 18 in [**LaSaUr1**]. Indeed, with notation as in that proof, and suppressing some of the initial work there, then

$\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{Q}) = |\mathsf{Q}|_{\omega\times\sigma}$ where $\omega\times\sigma$ denotes product measure on $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n$, and we have

$$\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{Q}_0) = \sum_{\zeta}\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{Q}_\zeta) + \sum_{\beta}\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{P}_\beta).$$

Now we have

$$\sum_{\zeta}\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{Q}_\zeta) = \sum_{\zeta}|\mathsf{Q}_\zeta|_{\omega\times\sigma} \le \sum_{\zeta}\mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)^2\,|\mathsf{Q}_\zeta|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\zeta}|\mathsf{Q}_\zeta|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}} &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}:\ 2^k\le\ell(Q_0)}\ \sum_{\zeta:\ \ell(Q_\zeta)=2^k}\left(2^{2nk}\right)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\
&\approx \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}:\ 2^k\le\ell(Q_0)}\left(\frac{2^k}{\ell(Q_0)}\right)^{-n}\left(2^{2nk}\right)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \qquad \text{(Whitney)} \\
&= \ell(Q_0)^n\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}:\ 2^k\le\ell(Q_0)}2^{nk\left(-1+2-\frac{2\alpha}{n}\right)} \\
&\le C_\alpha\ell(Q_0)^n\,\ell(Q_0)^{n\left(1-\frac{2\alpha}{n}\right)} = C_\alpha\,|Q_0\times Q_0|^{2-\frac{2\alpha}{n}} = C_\alpha\,|\mathsf{Q}_0|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}},
\end{aligned}$$

provided $0\le\alpha<\frac{n}{2}$. Since ω and σ have no point masses in common, it is not hard to show, using that the side length of $\mathsf{P}_\beta = P_\beta\times P_\beta'$ is 2^{-N} and $dist(\mathsf{P}_\beta,\mathcal{D})\le C2^{-N}$, that we have the following limit,

$$\sum_{\beta}\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{P}_\beta)\to 0 \text{ as } N\to\infty.$$

Indeed, if σ has no point masses at all, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\beta}\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{P}_\beta) &= \sum_{\beta}|P_\beta|_\omega\,|P_\beta'|_\sigma \\
&\le \left(\sum_{\beta}|P_\beta|_\omega\right)\sup_{\beta}|P_\beta'|_\sigma \\
&\le C\,|Q_0|_\omega\sup_{\beta}|P_\beta'|_\sigma\to 0 \text{ as } N\to\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

while if σ contains a point mass $c\delta_x$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\beta:\ x\in P_\beta'}\mathcal{A}_2(\omega,\sigma;\mathsf{P}_\beta) &\le \left(\sum_{\beta:\ x\in P_\beta'}|P_\beta|_\omega\right)\sup_{\beta:\ x\in P_\beta'}|P_\beta'|_\sigma \\
&\le C\left(\sum_{\beta:\ x\in P_\beta'}|P_\beta|_\omega\right)\to 0 \text{ as } N\to\infty
\end{aligned}$$

since ω has no point mass at x. This continues to hold if σ contains finitely many point masses disjoint from those of ω, and a limiting argument finally applies. This completes the proof that $A_2^\alpha\lesssim\mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)$ for $0\le\alpha<\frac{n}{2}$.

If we use this with $Q'=4\sqrt{n}Q$ together with (1.2), we obtain

$$\left(\int\frac{\ell(Q)^{n-\alpha}}{(\ell(Q)+|x|)^{2n-2\alpha}}d\omega(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\ell(Q)^{\alpha-n}\int_Q d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim\mathfrak{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{R}^\alpha)$$

or

$$\ell(Q)^{\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int\frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{\left|x-\zeta_Q\right|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{2n-2\alpha}}d\omega(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim\mathfrak{N}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{R}^{\alpha}).$$

Clearly we can reverse the roles of the measures ω and σ and obtain $\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha}\lesssim\mathfrak{N}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{R}^{\alpha})$ for the kernels $\mathbf{K}^{\alpha}$, $0\leq\alpha<\frac{n}{2}$.

Finally, to obtain the general case when T^{α} is elliptic, we note that the key estimate (1.1) above extends to the kernel K^{α} of T^{α} if there is sufficient separation between generalized quadrants, which in turn may require a larger constant than $4\sqrt{n}$ in the choice of Q' above. This completes the proof of Lemma 19. □

2. A weighted Haar basis

We will use a specific construction of the Haar basis in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is adapted to a measure μ (c.f. [**Hyt**]). Consider the unit cube $Q_0\equiv[0,1)^n$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}h^1&\equiv\mathbf{1}_{[0,\frac{1}{2})}+\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2},1)},\\ h^0&\equiv-\mathbf{1}_{[0,\frac{1}{2})}+\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2},1)},\end{aligned}$$

and for every multiindex $a\in\{0,1\}^n$ and $x\in Q_0$, define

$$H^a(x)=\prod_{k=1}^{n}h^{a_k}(x_k).$$

Then $H^a(x)$ equals ±1 on each of the 2^n dyadic subcubes of Q_0, and $\int H^a(x)\,dx=0$ for all $a\neq\mathbf{1}\equiv(1,1,...,1)$. Indeed, if $a_\ell=0$ then $\int_0^1 h^{a_\ell}(x_\ell)\,dx_\ell=\int_0^1 h^0(x_\ell)\,dx_\ell=0$ and

$$\int H^a(x)\,dx=\prod_{k=1}^{n}\int_{\mathbb{R}}h^{a_k}(x_k)\,dx_k=0.$$

Thus the functions $\{H^a\}_{a\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{\mathbf{1}\}}$ are the unweighted Haar functions associated with the unit cube Q_0.

We now adapt these Haar functions to a locally finite positive Borel measure μ on Q_0, and for convenience we assume that $\left|Q_\beta\right|_\mu>0$ for the dyadic children $\{Q_\beta\}_{\beta\in\{0,1\}^n}$ of Q_0. Here the cube Q_β is the child whose vertex closest to the origin is the point $\frac{1}{2}\beta=\left(\frac{\beta_1}{2},\frac{\beta_2}{2},...,\frac{\beta_n}{2}\right)$. We define the weighted Haar functions $\left\{H_\mu^a\right\}_{a\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{\mathbf{1}\}}$ by

$$H_\mu^a(x)\equiv\frac{1}{\gamma_\mu(Q_0)}H^a(x)\sum_{\beta\in\{0,1\}^n}\frac{1}{\left|Q_\beta\right|_\mu}\mathbf{1}_{Q_\beta}(x)$$

where the constant $\gamma_\mu(Q_0)$ is chosen so that $\left\|H_\mu^a\right\|_{L^2(\mu)}=1$ for all $a\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{\mathbf{1}\}$, i.e.

$$\gamma_\mu(Q_0)=\sqrt{\int\sum_{\beta\in\{0,1\}^n}\left(\frac{1}{\left|Q_\beta\right|_\mu}\right)^2\mathbf{1}_{Q_\beta}d\mu}=\sqrt{\sum_{\beta\in\{0,1\}^n}\frac{1}{\left|Q_\beta\right|_\mu}}.$$

Clearly, since $H^a(x)$ equals the constant $\mathbb{E}^{dx}_{Q_\beta} H^a$ on Q_β, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int H^a_\mu d\mu &= \int \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_\mu(Q_0)} H^a(x) \sum_{\beta\in\{0,1\}^n} \frac{1}{|Q_\beta|_\mu} \mathbf{1}_{Q_\beta}(x) \right) d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_\mu(Q_0)} \sum_{\beta\in\{0,1\}^n} \left(\mathbb{E}^{dx}_{Q_\beta} H^a\right) \frac{1}{|Q_\beta|_\mu} \int \mathbf{1}_{Q_\beta}(x)\, d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_\mu(Q_0)} \sum_{\beta\in\{0,1\}^n} \mathbb{E}^{dx}_{Q_\beta} H^a = \frac{1}{\gamma_\mu(Q_0)} \int H^a(x)\, dx = 0,\end{aligned}$$

for $a \in \{0,1\}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{1}\}$. Thus the functions $\left\{H^a_\mu\right\}_{\alpha\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{\mathbf{1}\}}$ are the Haar functions associated with Q_0, and the remainder of the Haar basis

$$\left\{ \left(H^a_\mu\right)_Q \right\}_{\substack{a\in\Gamma_n \\ Q\in\mathcal{D}}}, \qquad \Gamma_n \equiv \{0,1\}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{1}\},$$

for $L^2(\mu)$ is obtained by appropriately translating and dilating the functions $\left\{H^a_\mu\right\}_{\alpha\in\Gamma_n}$ to the dyadic cubes Q in the grid $\mathcal{D}$. In order to match our one-dimensional notation as closely as possible, we will denote the Haar function $\left(H^a_\mu\right)_Q$ by $h^{\mu,a}_Q$:

$$h^{\mu,a}_Q \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{Q'\in\mathfrak{C}(Q)} \frac{1}{|Q'|_\mu}}} \sum_{Q'\in\mathfrak{C}(Q)} a\left(\frac{Q'}{Q}\right) \frac{1}{|Q'|_\mu} \mathbf{1}_{Q'}\ , \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{C}(Q)$ denotes the children of Q, and where

$$a\left(\begin{array}{c} Q' \\ Q \end{array}\right) \equiv \mathbb{E}^{dx}_{Q_\beta} H^a \in \{-1,1\},$$

if $Q' \in \mathfrak{C}(Q)$ is a child of Q that occupies the same relative position inside Q as the child $Q_\beta \in \mathfrak{C}(Q_0)$ does inside the unit cube Q_0.

3. Monotonicity lemma and Energy lemma

The Monotonicity Lemma below will be used in proving our theorem. It will use the n *coordinate* Haar functions $\{h^{\omega,e_k}_J\}_{k=1}^n$ associated with the cube J defined in (2.1) above, where $e_k = (1,...,1,0,1,...,1)$ is the multiindex in $\{0,1\}^n$ with 0 in the k^{th} position and 1 elsewhere, i.e.the *complement* of the unit k^{th} coordinate vector.

3.0.1. *The monotonicity lemma.* For $0 \le \alpha < n$, we recall the fractional Poisson integral

$$\mathrm{P}^\alpha(J,\mu) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left(|J|^{\frac{1}{n}} + |y-c_J|\right)^{n+1-\alpha}} d\mu(y).$$

Lemma 20 (Monotonicity). *Suppose that I, J and J^* are cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $J \subset J^* \subset 2J^* \subset I$, and that μ is a positive measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ supported outside I. Suppose that $h^{\omega,a}_J$ is a Haar function associated with J. Finally suppose that T^α is a standard fractional singular integral on $\mathbb{R}^n$ as defined in Definition 15 with $0 < \alpha < n$. Then we have the estimate*

$$\left|\langle T^\alpha\mu, h^{\omega,a}_J\rangle_\omega\right| \lesssim \frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha(J^*,\mu)}{|J^*|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \widehat{X}^\omega(J), \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{X}^{\omega}(J) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left\langle x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell},h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}\right\rangle_{\omega}=\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\widehat{x^{\ell}}(J,e_\ell),\\ c_J &= \left(c_J^1,...,c_J^n\right)\ \text{is the center of } J.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The general case follows easily from the case $J^*=J$, so we assume this restriction. The inner product $\left\langle x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell},h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}\right\rangle_{\omega}$ is positive since the function $\left(x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell}\right)h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}(x)$ is nonnegative and supported on the cube J. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left\langle x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell},h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}\right\rangle_{\omega} &= \int\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left(x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell}\right)h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}(x)\right)d\omega(x)\\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\int\left|x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell}\right|\left|h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}(x)\right|d\omega(x).\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

Now we use the smoothness estimate (0.4), the assumptions that $x\in J$ and $y\notin 2J$, and then (3.2) and the fact that $|h_J^{\omega,a}|=\left|h_J^{\omega,a'}\right|$ for all a,a', to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\langle T^{\alpha}\mu,h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_{\omega}\right| &= \left|\int\left\{\int K^{\alpha}(x,y)\,h_J^{\omega,a}(x)\,d\omega(x)\right\}d\mu(y)\right|=\left|\int\left\langle K_y^{\alpha},h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_{\omega}d\mu(y)\right|\\ &= \left|\int\left\langle K_y^{\alpha}(x)-K_y^{\alpha}(c_J),h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_{\omega}d\mu(y)\right|\\ &\leq \left\langle\int_{y\notin 2J}\left|K_y^{\alpha}(x)-K_y^{\alpha}(c_J)\right|d\mu(y),\left|h_J^{\omega,a}(x)\right|\right\rangle_{\omega}\\ &\leq C\left\langle\int_{y\notin 2J}\frac{|x-c_J|}{|y-c_J|^{n+1-\alpha}}d\mu(y),\left|h_J^{\omega,a}(x)\right|\right\rangle_{\omega}\\ &\leq C\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mu)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\left\langle\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left|x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell}\right|,\left|h_J^{\omega,a}\right|\right\rangle_{\omega}\\ &= C\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mu)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left\langle x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell},h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}\right\rangle_{\omega}=C\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mu)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\widehat{X}^{\omega}(J).\end{aligned}$$

□

When $n=1$ and $\alpha=0$, the estimate in the Monotonicity Lemma was reversed for the Hilbert transform in (1.2) of Part 1, i.e.

$$\frac{\mathrm{P}(J^*,\mu)}{|J^*|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\widehat{x}^{\omega}(J)\lesssim\langle H\mu,h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_{\omega},$$

and this turned out to be the key to deriving control of the functional energy constant $\mathfrak{F}$ by $\mathcal{A}_2$ and the testing conditions for the Hilbert transform.

We thank Michael Lacey for pointing out to us an example showing that inequality (3.1) cannot be reversed in higher dimensions for the vector of Riesz tranforms. His example is similar to the following modification of an example in the first version of this paper.

EXAMPLE 2. *(M. Lacey) The simple reverse monotonicity inequality*

$$\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mu)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\widehat{X}^{\omega}(J)\lesssim\left(\sum_{k\in F}\left|\langle R_k^{\alpha}\mu,h_J^{\omega,e_k}\rangle_{\omega}\right|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is false. Indeed, take $T=R_k$ and let $\mu=\delta_{z_0}$ be a point mass located outside CJ. Then the quantities $\frac{\partial K_y}{\partial x_\ell}(c_J)$ are constants when integrated against μ, and thus the equation $\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left(x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell}\right)\frac{\partial K_y}{\partial x_\ell}(c_J)=0$ defines a hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that contains the point c_J. The basic idea of the example is to take $k=1,2,...,n-1$, consider the intersection of the $n-1$ hyperplanes that define a line in $\mathbb{R}^n$ through c_J, and let ω consist of two point masses located on that line away from c_J but within J. Then the right hand side of the monotonicity inequality is large, while the left hand side is of order ε if the two point masses on the line are balanced correctly, so the monotonicity lemma cannot be reversed by simply using the Riesz transform.
*To make this example fit our hypotheses, let $z_0=c_J+t(1,1,...,1)$ for $t\in\mathbb{R}$. Then the $n-1$ vectors $v_k\equiv\left[\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_\ell}(c_J,z_0)\right]_{\ell=1}^{n}$ for $k=1,2,...,n-1$ are linearly independent. Thus the intersection of the hyperplanes $\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left(x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell}\right)\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_\ell}(c_J,z_0)=0$ defines a line L through c_J. Let $\omega=\sum_{m=1}^{2^n+1}\delta_{s_m}$ be a sum of 2^n+1 point masses of mass 1 each. Put two of the point masses, say δ_{s_1} and δ_{s_2}, on the line L in one of the children very close to opposite boundaries of J, and locate the remaining 2^n-1 point masses very close to c_J, at distance comparable to ε. Then all the children of J are charged, the Haar functions associated to J are balanced, and the right hand side of the monotonicity inequality is large. This is due to the fact that the masses δ_{s_1} and δ_{s_2} contribute almost 2 while the the others contribute order ε, because for those point masses the vector $\widehat{X}^{\omega}(J)=\left[\langle x^{\ell}-c_J^{\ell},h_J^{\omega,e_\ell}\rangle\right]_{\ell=1}^{n}=\left[\widehat{x^{\ell}}(J,e_\ell)\right]_{\ell=1}^{n}$ has all components comparable in size to ε. On the other hand, the left hand side of the monotonicity inequality is of size ε for $T=R_k$, $1\leq k\leq n-1$, on account of the construction of the line L, the contribution of point masses ε-close to c_J, the balanced positioning of δ_{s_1} and δ_{s_2}, and finally the above error estimate (**??**) of size ε.*

3.0.2. *The energy lemma.* Suppose now we are given a cube $J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$, and a subset $\mathcal{H}$ of the dyadic subgrid $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}(J)$ of cubes from $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ that are contained in J. Let $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}^{\omega}=\sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\triangle_{J'}^{\omega}$ be the ω-Haar projection onto $\mathcal{H}$ and define the $\mathcal{H}$-energy $\mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(J,\omega)$ of ω on the cube J by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(J,\omega)^2 &\equiv \frac{1}{|J|_{\omega}}\int_J\left(\mathbb{E}_J^{\omega(dx')}\frac{\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}^{\omega(dx)}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}')}{|J|}\right)^2 d\omega(x)\\ &= \frac{1}{|J|_{\omega}}\int_J\left(\frac{\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}^{\omega}\mathbf{x}}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2 d\omega(x)\\ &= \frac{1}{|J|_{\omega}}\sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle\frac{\mathbf{x}}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}},h_{J'}^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^2\approx\frac{1}{|J|_{\omega}|J|^{\frac{2}{n}}}\sum_{J'\in\mathcal{H}}\left|\widehat{X}^{\omega}(J')\right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

For ν a signed measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathcal{H}$ a subset of the dyadic subgrid $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}(J)$, and $0 \leq \alpha < n$, we define the functional

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{H}}^{\alpha}(J,\nu) \equiv \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mu)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \left| \widehat{X}^{\omega}(J') \right|^2 .$$

Lemma 21 (**Energy Lemma**). *Let J be a cube in $\mathcal{D}^{\omega}$. Let Ψ_J be an $L^2(\omega)$ function supported in J and with ω-integral zero. Let ν be a signed measure supported in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus 2J$ and denote the Haar support of Ψ_J by $\mathcal{H} = supp\widehat{\Psi_J}$. Let T^{α} be a standard α-fractional Calderón-Zygmund operator with $0 \leq \alpha < n$. Then we have*

$$\left| \left\langle T^{\alpha}(\nu), \Psi_J \right\rangle_{\omega} \right| \leq C \left\| \Psi_J \right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \Phi_{\mathcal{H}}^{\alpha}(J,\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}} .$$

Proof. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left\langle T^{\alpha}\nu, \Psi_J \right\rangle_{\omega} \right| &= \left| \int_J \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J} K^{\alpha}(x,y)\ \Psi_J(x)\, d\nu(y)\ d\omega(x) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_J \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J} K^{\alpha}(x,y) \ \sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \langle \Psi_J, h_{J'}^{\omega,a} \rangle_{\omega} \, h_{J'}^{\omega,a}(x)\, d\nu(y)\ d\omega(x) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J} \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \left\langle K_y^{\alpha}, h_{J'}^{\omega,a} \right\rangle_{\omega} \ \widehat{\Psi_J}(J')\ d\nu(y) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus 2J} \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \int_{J'} \left[K_y^{\alpha}(x) - K_y^{\alpha}(c_j) \right] h_{J'}^{\omega,a}(x)\, d\omega(x)\ \widehat{\Psi_J}(J')\ d\nu(y) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left\langle T^{\alpha}\nu, \Psi_J \right\rangle_{\omega} \right| &\lesssim \sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J',|\nu|)}{|J'|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \widehat{X}^{\omega}(J')\, \widehat{\Psi_J}(J') \\ &\lesssim \left(\sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J',|\nu|)}{|J'|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \widehat{X}^{\omega}(J')^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{J' \in \mathcal{H}} \left| \widehat{\Psi_J}(J') \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \Phi_{\mathcal{H}}^{\alpha}(J,\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \Psi_J \right\|_{L^2(\omega)} . \end{aligned}$$

□

4. Functional energy and the energy condition

We begin by introducing the functional energy constant $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha}$ in higher dimensions. We repeat three of the definitions from Part 1, but with appropriate adaptations.

Definition 16. *A collection $\mathcal{F}$ of dyadic cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is σ-*Carleson *if*

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}:\ F \subset S} |F|_{\sigma} \leq C_{\mathcal{F}} |S|_{\sigma}, \qquad S \in \mathcal{F}.$$

The constant $C_{\mathcal{F}}$ is referred to as the Carleson norm of $\mathcal{F}$.

Definition 17. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a collection of dyadic cubes. A collection of functions $\{g_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ in $L^2(\omega)$ is said to be $\mathcal{F}$-*adapted* if for each $F\in\mathcal{F}$, there is a collection $\mathcal{J}(F)$ of cubes in $\mathcal{D}^\omega$ such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(F)\subset\{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega : J\Subset F\}$$

and such that each of the following three conditions hold:

1. *for each $F\in\mathcal{F}$, the Haar coefficients $\widehat{g_F}(J,a)=\langle g_F,h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_\omega$ of g_F are nonnegative and supported in $\mathcal{J}(F)$, i.e.*
$$\begin{cases}\widehat{g_F}(J)\geq 0 & \text{for all} \quad J\in\mathcal{J}(F)\\ \widehat{g_F}(J)=0 & \text{for all} \quad J\notin\mathcal{J}(F)\end{cases},\qquad F\in\mathcal{F},$$
2. *the collection $\{g_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ is pairwise orthogonal in $L^2(\omega)$,*
3. *there is a positive constant C such that if $\mathcal{J}^*(F)$ consists of the maximal cubes in $\mathcal{J}(F)$, then for every cube I in $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$, the collection of cubes*
$$\mathcal{B}_I\equiv\{J^*\subset I : J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F) \text{ for some } F\supset I\}$$
has overlap bounded by C, i.e. $\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{B}_I}\mathbf{1}_{J^*}\leq C$, for all $I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma$.

Definition 18. *Let $\mathfrak{F}^\alpha$ be the smallest constant in the '**f**unctional energy' inequality below, holding for all non-negative $h\in L^2(\sigma)$, all σ-Carleson collections $\mathcal{F}$, and all $\mathcal{F}$-adapted collections $\{g_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$:*

(4.1)
$$\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{J}^*(F)}\mathrm{P}^\alpha(J^*,h\sigma)\left|\left\langle\frac{x}{|J^*|^{\frac{1}{n}}},g_F\mathbf{1}_{J^*}\right\rangle_\omega\right|\leq\mathfrak{F}^\alpha\|h\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left[\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\|g_F\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\right]^{1/2}.$$

There is a corresponding dual functional energy constant $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha,*}$ obtained by interchanging the roles of σ and ω in (4.1).

Problem 1. *We do not know if the functional energy constants $\mathfrak{F}^\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha,*}$ are controlled by $\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha$ and the cube testing constants $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathbf{R}^\alpha}$ and $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathbf{R}^{\alpha,*}}$ for the α-fractional Riesz transforms, or even if they are necessary for the boundedness of the α-fractional Riesz transform vector $\mathbf{R}^\alpha$ from $L^2(\sigma)$ to $L^2(\omega)$.*

Now we define the natural extension to higher dimensions of the one-dimensional energy constant $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$ and its dual $\mathcal{E}^{\alpha,*}$. Then we will prove that they are controlled by the functional energy constants $\mathfrak{F}^\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha,*}$.

Definition 19. *Define the energy constant*

$$(\mathcal{E}^\alpha)^2\equiv\sup\frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\sum_{r=1}^\infty\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha(I_r,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma)}{|I_r|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{J\Subset I_r}\widehat{X}^\omega(J)^2, \tag{4.2}$$

where the supremum is taken over

1. *all dyadic grids $\mathcal{D}$,*
2. *all $\mathcal{D}$-dyadic cubes I,*
3. *and all subpartitions $\{I_r\}_{r=1}^\infty$ of the interval I into $\mathcal{D}$-dyadic subcubes I_r.*

There is a similar definition for the backward energy constant $\mathcal{E}^{\alpha,*}$. The basic result proved here is this.

Lemma 22. *Let $0\leq\alpha<n$. We have the energy condition,*

$$\mathcal{E}^\alpha\lesssim\mathfrak{F}^\alpha\ .$$

Proof. The proof is by duality. Fix a subpartition $\{I_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ of the interval I into $\mathcal{D}$-dyadic subcubes I_r. Let $\mathcal{F} \equiv \{I_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty} \cup \{I\}$, and note that $\mathcal{F}$ trivially satisfies the Carleson condition (16). Let $\mathcal{M}(I_r)$ consist of the maximal deeply embedded subcubes of I_r, and set

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(I_r) &\equiv \bigcup_{J^*\in\mathcal{M}(I_r)} \{J \in \mathcal{D} : J \subset J^*\}, \\
\widetilde{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(I) &\equiv \bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(I_r).
\end{aligned}$$

Given a sequence $\{a_J\}_{J\in\widetilde{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(I)}$ of nonnegative numbers (with all but finitely many vanishing), define

$$g_{I_r} = \sum_{J\in\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(I_r)} a_J \sum_{k=1}^{n} h_J^{\omega,e_k}, \qquad \text{for } 1 \leq r < \infty \text{ and } J^* \in \mathcal{M}(I_r).$$

Then $\{g_{I_r}\}_{r=1}^{\infty} = \{g_F\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}\setminus\{I\}}$ is $\mathcal{F}$-adapted and the functional energy inequality (4.1) with $h = \mathbf{1}_I$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(I_r, \mathbf{1}_I \sigma)}{|I_r|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right) \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{M}(I_r)} \sum_{J\subset J^*} \widehat{X}^{\omega}(J)\, a_J \\
\approx\ & \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{M}(F)} \mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J^*, h\sigma) \left| \left\langle \frac{x}{|J^*|^{\frac{1}{n}}}, g_F \mathbf{1}_{J^*} \right\rangle_{\omega} \right| \\
\leq\ & \mathfrak{F}^{\alpha} \|h\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \left[\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \|g_F\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2\right]^{1/2} \\
\lesssim\ & \mathfrak{F}^{\alpha} \sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\| \left(\sum_{J\widetilde{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(I)} |a_J|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Duality now yields

$$\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(I_r, \mathbf{1}_I \sigma)}{|I_r|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2 \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{M}(I_r)} \sum_{J\subset J^*} \widehat{X}^{\omega}(J)^2 \lesssim (\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha})^2 |I|_{\sigma},$$

which gives

$$\mathcal{E}^{\alpha} \lesssim \mathfrak{F}^{\alpha}.$$

□

4.1. Functional energy and side conditions. Here we show that the functional energy condition is implied by the Energy Hypothesis, condition (1.16) in [**LaSaUr**]. The proof is taken from unpublished work of the authors with M. Lacey in the one-dimensional case with $\alpha = 0$.

Recall that the energy $\mathsf{E}(I, \omega)$ of a measure ω on a dyadic cube I is given by

$$\mathsf{E}(I,\omega)^2 = \frac{1}{|I|_{\omega}} \int_I \left| \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}_I^{\omega} \mathbf{x}}{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right|^2 d\omega(x) = \frac{1}{|I|_{\omega}} \sum_{J\subset I} \sum_{a\in\Gamma_n} \left| \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{x}}{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}, h_J^{\omega,a} \right\rangle_{\omega} \right|^2,$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ and the second equality follows from the fact that the Haar functions $\{h_J^{\omega,a} : J \subset I \text{ and } a \in \Gamma_n\}$ form an orthonormal basis of

$$\left\{ f \in L^2(\omega) : \operatorname{supp} f \subset I \text{ and } \int f d\omega = 0 \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be Calderón-Zygmund stopping times for $f \in L^2(\sigma)$, and let $\mathcal{C}_F^\sigma$ be the corresponding coronas for $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $\mathcal{M}(F)$ be the maximal deeply embedded subcubes of F. Define

$$h(G) = I\left[\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot)} f\right) \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot)\setminus\cdot}\right](F) = \sum_{F' \preccurlyeq F} \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')} f\right) \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')\setminus F'} \tag{4.3}$$

where $F' \preccurlyeq F$ refers to partial order in the tree $\mathcal{F}$, i.e. this means $F', F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F' \supset F$. We denote by $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')$ the parent of F' in the tree $\mathcal{F}$.

The *α-strong energy inequality* is

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{M}(F)} |J|_\omega \, \mathsf{E}(J,\omega)^2 \, \mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J, \widetilde{h}(G)\sigma\right)^2 \leq (\mathcal{SE}^\alpha)^2 \int |f|^2 \sigma, \tag{4.4}$$

for $\widetilde{h}(F) = \sum_{F' \preccurlyeq F} \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')} |f|\right) \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')\setminus F'}$, and where the α-strong energy constant $\mathcal{SE}^\alpha$ is the smallest constant for which (4.4) holds. Note that $|h(G)| \leq \widetilde{h}(G)$.

We show here that the α-strong energy inequality follows from the α-Energy Hypothesis (4.6) defined below. For fixed $\gamma, \varepsilon > 0$, define $\Psi^\alpha_{\gamma,\varepsilon}$ by

$$\Psi^\alpha_{\gamma,\varepsilon}(I, E) \equiv \sup_{I \supset \bigcup_{s \geq 1} J_s} \left[\inf_{s \geq 1} \left(\frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{|J_s|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^\gamma\right] \sum_{s \geq 1} \Phi^\alpha(J_s, E), \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\Phi^\alpha(J_s, E) \equiv \Phi(I, E) \equiv \omega(I) \, \mathsf{E}(I,\omega)^2 \, \mathrm{P}^\alpha(I, \mathbf{1}_E \sigma)^2,$$

and where the supremum is taken over all ε-good subpartitions $\{J_s\}$ of the interval I. Note that $\Psi^\alpha_{\gamma,\varepsilon}(I, E)$ becomes smaller as either γ or ε becomes smaller, and also as E becomes smaller. The *Energy Hypothesis* from [**LaSaUr**], generalized to $0 \leq \alpha < n$, is this condition:

$$\sum_{r \geq 1} \Psi^\alpha_{\gamma,\varepsilon}(I_r, I_0) \leq \left(\mathcal{F}^\alpha_{\gamma,\varepsilon}\right)^2 |I_0|_\sigma, \qquad \text{for } \textit{all} \text{ subpartitions } \{I_r\} \text{ of } I_0 . \tag{4.6}$$

Lemma 23. *(M. Lacey and the authors) Let $0 \leq \alpha < n$. Then*

$$\mathcal{SE}^\alpha \lesssim \mathcal{F}^\alpha_{\gamma,\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J, \widetilde{h}(G)\sigma\right) &= \sum_{F' \preccurlyeq F} \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')} |f|\right) \mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J, \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')\setminus F'} \sigma\right) \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{F' \preccurlyeq F} d_{\mathcal{F}}(F, F')^2 \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')} |f|\right)^2 \mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J, \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')\setminus F'} \sigma\right)^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{F'\preccurlyeq F} d_{\mathcal{F}}\left(F,F'\right)^{-2}\lesssim C$ independent of F, where $d_{\mathcal{F}}$ is distance in the tree $\mathcal{F}$. We thus have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{F}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left|J\right|_{\omega}\mathsf{E}\left(J,\omega\right)^{2}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J,\left|h\left(G\right)\right|\sigma\right)^{2}\\
\lesssim&\sum_{F}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left|J\right|_{\omega}\mathsf{E}\left(J,\omega\right)^{2}\sum_{F'\preccurlyeq F}d_{\mathcal{F}}\left(F,F'\right)^{2}\left|\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')}f\right|^{2}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')\setminus F'}\sigma\right)^{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we use that

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}\left(F,F'\right)\leq C_{\gamma}\left(\frac{\left|F'\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left|F\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{4}}\leq C_{\gamma}\inf_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left(\frac{\left|F'\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left|J\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{4}}$$

for all pairs $\left(F,F'\right)$ of cubes in $\mathcal{F}$. Denote the $\mathcal{F}$-children of F by $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}\left(F\right)$, and more generally for $t\geq 1$, denote the grandchildren at generation t of F by

$$\mathfrak{C}^{(t)}_{\mathcal{F}}\left(F\right)\equiv\left\{K\in\mathcal{F}:\pi^{(t)}_{\mathcal{F}}K=F\right\}.$$

We conclude upon replacing $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}\left(F'\right)$ with I, and F' with I', that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left|J\right|_{\omega}\mathsf{E}\left(J,\omega\right)^{2}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J,\widetilde{h}\left(G\right)\sigma\right)^{2}\\
\lesssim&\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left|J\right|_{\omega}\mathsf{E}\left(J,\omega\right)^{2}\sum_{F'\preccurlyeq F}\inf_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left(\frac{\left|F'\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left|J\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')}\left|f\right|\right)^{2}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(F')\setminus F'}\sigma\right)^{2}\\
=&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{I}\left|f\right|\right)^{2}\sum_{I'\in\mathfrak{C}(I)}\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}\sum_{F\in\mathfrak{C}^{(t)}(I)}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left|J\right|_{\omega}\mathsf{E}\left(J,\omega\right)^{2}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus I'}\sigma\right)^{2}\inf_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left(\frac{\left|I'\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left|J\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\\
\leq&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{I}\left|f\right|\right)^{2}\sum_{I'\in\mathfrak{C}(I)}\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}\left\{\sum_{F\in\mathfrak{C}^{(t)}(I)}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\Phi^{\alpha}\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus I'}\sigma\right)\right\}\inf_{J\in\mathcal{M}(F)}\left(\frac{\left|I'\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\left|J\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\gamma}2^{-t\frac{\gamma}{2}}\\
\lesssim&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{I}\left|f\right|\right)^{2}\sum_{I'\in\mathfrak{C}(I)}\Psi^{\alpha}_{\gamma,\varepsilon}\left(I',\mathbf{1}_{I\setminus I'}\sigma\right)\leq\left(\mathcal{F}^{\alpha}_{\gamma,\varepsilon}\right)^{2}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\sigma}_{I}\left|f\right|\right)^{2}\sigma\left|I\right|_{\sigma}\leq\left(\mathcal{F}^{\alpha}_{\gamma,\varepsilon}\right)^{2}\int\left|f\right|^{2}\sigma,
\end{aligned}$$

by the α-Energy Hypothesis (4.6). □

One can show that the above argument also applies to prove that the more refined functional energy constant $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha}$ satisfies

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha}\lesssim\mathcal{F}^{\alpha}_{\gamma,\varepsilon}.$$

CHAPTER 8

Basic constructs

We begin by describing the basic constructs of the proof, beginning with the parallel corona splitting and bounded fluctuation. Functional energy has already been introduced above. In subsequent chapters we deal with the decompositions of functions into coronas where both averages and stopping energy are controlled.

1. The parallel corona splitting

The first construction we describe in our proof of Theorem 3 is the following analogue of the parallel corona splitting in Part 1. For convenience in notation we will sometimes suppress the dependence on α in our nonlinear forms, but will retain it in the operators, Poisson integrals and constants. We will assume that the good/bad cube machinery of Nazarov, Treil and Volberg is in force here. We make no further comment on this as it is well established in the literature.

We briefly recall the previous set up on the real line $\mathbb{R}$, but now adapted to Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ and $\mathcal{D}^\omega$ be an r-good pair of grids on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\{h_I^\sigma\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma}$ and $\{h_J^\omega\}_{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega}$ be the corresponding Haar bases, so that

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma} \triangle_I^\sigma f = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma} \langle f, h_I^\sigma\rangle \ h_I^\sigma = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma} \widehat{f}(I) \ h_I^\sigma, \\ g &= \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega} \triangle_J^\omega g = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega} \langle g, h_J^\omega\rangle \ h_J^\omega = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega} \widehat{g}(J) \ h_J^\omega, \end{aligned}$$

where the appropriate grid is understood in the notation $\widehat{f}(I)$ and $\widehat{g}(J)$.

Inequality (0.5) is equivalent to boundedness of the bilinear form

$$\mathcal{T}(f,g) \equiv \langle T_\sigma^\alpha(f), g\rangle_\omega = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma \text{ and } J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega} \langle T_\sigma^\alpha(\triangle_I^\sigma f), \triangle_J^\omega g\rangle_\omega$$

on $L^2(\sigma)\times L^2(\omega)$, i.e.

$$|\mathcal{T}(f,g)| \leq \mathfrak{N} \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} .$$

We now introduce stopping trees $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ for the functions $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g\in L^2(\omega)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ (respectively $\mathcal{G}$) be a collection of Calderón-Zygmund stopping cubes for f (respectively g), and let $\mathcal{D}^\sigma = \bigcup_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{C}_F$ (respectively $\mathcal{D}^\omega = \bigcup_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{C}_G$) be the associated corona decomposition of the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ (respectively $\mathcal{D}^\omega$).

For a cube $I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ let $\pi_{\mathcal{D}^\sigma}I$ be the $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$-parent of I in the grid $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$, and let $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}I$ be the smallest member of $\mathcal{F}$ that contains I. For $F,F'\in\mathcal{F}$, we say that F' is an $\mathcal{F}$-child of F if $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}(\pi_{\mathcal{D}^\sigma}F') = F$ (it could be that $F = \pi_{\mathcal{D}^\sigma}F'$), and we denote by $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ the set of $\mathcal{F}$-children of F. For $F\in\mathcal{F}$, define the projection $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma$ onto the linear span of the Haar functions $\{h_I^\sigma\}_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}$ by

$$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\triangle_I^\sigma f=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\left\langle f,h_I^\sigma\right\rangle_\sigma h_I^\sigma .$$

The standard properties of these projections are

$$f=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f,\qquad\int\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right)\sigma=0,\qquad\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\left\|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2 .$$

There are similar definitions and formulas for the tree $\mathcal{G}$ and grid $\mathcal{D}^\omega$.

Remark 14. *The stopping cubes $\mathcal{F}$ live in the full dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$, while the cubes $I\in\mathcal{C}_F$ are restricted to the* good *subgrid $\mathcal{D}_{good}^\sigma$. It is important to observe that the arguments used in this paper never appeal to a 'good' property for stopping cubes, only for cubes in the Haar support of f. A similar remark applies to $\mathcal{G}$ and the Haar support of g.*

Now recall the notion of *general stopping data* introduced in Definition 1. This definition applies equally well to $\mathbb{R}^n$ and we restate it here without change.

Definition 20. *Suppose we are given a positive constant $C_0\geq 4$, a subset $\mathcal{F}$ of the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ (called the stopping times), and a corresponding sequence $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}\equiv\{\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\}_{F\in\mathcal{F}}$ of nonnegative numbers $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\geq 0$ (called the stopping data). Let $(\mathcal{F},\prec,\pi_{\mathcal{F}})$ be the tree structure on $\mathcal{F}$ inherited from $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$, and for each $F\in\mathcal{F}$ denote by $\mathcal{C}_F=\{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma:\pi_{\mathcal{F}}I=F\}$ the corona associated with F:*

$$\mathcal{C}_F=\left\{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma:I\subset F\text{ and }I\not\subset F'\text{ for any }F'\prec F\right\}.$$

We say the triple $(C_0,\mathcal{F},\alpha_{\mathcal{F}})$ constitutes stopping data *for a function $f\in L_{loc}^1(\sigma)$ if*

1. $\mathbb{E}_I^\sigma|f|\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)$ *for all* $I\in\mathcal{C}_F$ *and* $F\in\mathcal{F}$,
2. $\sum_{F'\preceq F}|F'|_\sigma\leq C_0|F|_\sigma$ *for all* $F\in\mathcal{F}$,
3. $\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)^2|F|_\sigma\leq C_0^2\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2$,
4. $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\leq\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F')$ *whenever* $F',F\in\mathcal{F}$ *with* $F'\subset F$.

Definition 21. *If $(C_0,\mathcal{F},\alpha_{\mathcal{F}})$ constitutes (general)* stopping data *for a function $f\in L_{loc}^1(\sigma)$, we refer to the othogonal decomposition*

$$f=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f;\qquad\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\equiv\sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}_F}\triangle_I^\sigma f,$$

as the (general) corona decomposition *of f associated with the stopping times $\mathcal{F}$.*

Now suppose we have stopping data for both f and g. We now consider the following *parallel corona splitting* of the inner product $\langle T(f\sigma),g\rangle_\omega$ that involves the projections $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma$ acting on f and the projections $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^\omega$ acting on g. These forms are no longer linear in f and g as the 'cut' is determined by the coronas $\mathcal{C}_F$ and

$\mathcal{C}_G$, which depend on f and g. We have

$$\begin{aligned}(1.1)\quad \left\langle T_\sigma^\alpha f,g\right\rangle_\omega &= \sum_{(F,G)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}} \left\langle T_\sigma^\alpha\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right),\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^\omega g\right)\right\rangle_\omega \\ &= \left\{\sum_{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}+\sum_{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}+\sum_{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}\right\} \\ &\qquad\qquad \times\left\langle H_\sigma\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right),\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G}^\omega g\right)\right\rangle_\omega \\ &\equiv \mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g)+\mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f,g)+\mathsf{T}_{far}(f,g).\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ is the set of pairs $(F,G)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}$ such that G is the *minimal* interval in $\mathcal{G}$ that contains F, or F is the *minimal* interval in $\mathcal{F}$ that contains G, more precisely: either

$$F\subset G\text{ and there is no }G_1\in\mathcal{G}\setminus\{G\}\text{ with }F\subset G_1\subset G,$$

or

$$G\subset F\text{ and there is no }F_1\in\mathcal{F}\setminus\{F\}\text{ with }G\subset F_1\subset F.$$

The set $\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ is the set of pairs $(F,G)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}$ such that $F\cap G=\emptyset$. The set $\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ is the complement of $\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\cup\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})$ in $\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}$:

$$\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})=\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}\setminus\left\{\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\cup\mathsf{Disjoint}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\right\}.$$

We have the following basic reduction involving the constant $\mathfrak{A}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{A}_\alpha\equiv\mathcal{A}_2^\alpha+\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha,*}+\mathfrak{T}_\alpha^2+\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha,*}^2+\mathcal{E}_\alpha^2+\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,*}^2\ .$$

Here $\mathfrak{A}_\alpha$ is the sum of the constants in the conditions of Theorem 3.

Proposition 7. *Let*

$$\left\langle T_\sigma^\alpha(f),g\right\rangle_\omega=\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g)+\mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f,g)+\mathsf{T}_{far}(f,g)$$

be a parallel corona decomposition as in (1.1) of the bilinear form $\left\langle T^\alpha(f\sigma),g\right\rangle_\omega$ *with stopping data* $\mathcal{F}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *for* f *and* g *respectively. Then we have*

$$\left|\left\langle T_\sigma^\alpha f,g\right\rangle_\omega-\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g)\right|\lesssim\mathfrak{A}\ \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},$$

for all $f\in L^2(\sigma),g\in L^2(\omega)$.

2. Bounded fluctuation

The notion of bounded fluctuation is an extension of the notion of bounded function intermediate between L^∞ and BMO^{dyadic}, and is closely tied to the corona projections in the CZ corona decomposition. The definition extends to Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ in the obvious way.

Definition 22. *Given* $\gamma>0$*, a cube* $K\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma$*, and a function* f *supported on* K*, we say that* f *is a function of* bounded fluctuation *on* K*, written* $f\in\mathcal{BF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(K)$*, if there is a pairwise disjoint collection* $\mathcal{K}_f$ *of* $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$*-subcubes of* K *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_K f\sigma &= 0,\\ f &= a_{K'}\ \textit{(a constant) on }K',\qquad K'\in\mathcal{K}_f,\\ |a_{K'}| &> \gamma,\qquad K'\in\mathcal{K}_f,\\ \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I|f|\sigma &\le 1,\qquad I\in\widehat{\mathcal{K}_f},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}_f}=\left\{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma : I\subset K \text{ and } I\not\subset K' \text{ for any } K'\in\mathcal{K}_f\right\}$$

is the corona determined by K and $\mathcal{K}_f$.

In the case $\gamma>1$, we see that f is of bounded fluctuation on K if it is supported in K with mean zero, and equals a constant $a_{K'}$ of modulus greater than γ on any subcube K' where $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{K'}|f|>1$. Thus in the case $\gamma>1$, the collection of distinguished cubes is uniquely determined, but in general $\mathcal{K}_f$ must be specified. If we also require in Definition 22 that

$$a_{K'}>\gamma,\qquad K'\in\mathcal{K}_f,$$

then we denote the resulting collection of functions by $\mathcal{PBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(K)$ and refer to such an f as a function of *positive* bounded fluctuation on K.

3. Standard preliminaries and outline of the proof

A by now standard reduction of our theorem is delivered by the following lemmas, that in the case of one dimension are due to Nazarov, Treil and Volberg (see [**NTV4**] and [**Vol**]). The proofs extend easily to higher dimensions and we will illustrate this by carrying out one typical estimate below. We note that it is here that the most restrictive condition is placed on α. In order to accomodate the fact that the Poisson kernel is just *one* power larger than necessary for integrability at infinity, we are forced to impose the restriction $0\le\alpha<1$.

Lemma 24. *Suppose T^α is a standard fractional singular integral with $0\le\alpha<1$. For $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g\in L^2(\omega)$ we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{D}^\omega\\ 2^{-r}|I|\le|J|\le2^r|I|}}\left|\left\langle T^\alpha_\sigma\left(\triangle^\sigma_I f\right),\triangle^\omega_J g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{T}_\alpha+\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha,*}+\sqrt{\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2+\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,*}_2}\right)\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{D}^\omega\\ I\cap J=\emptyset \text{ and } \frac{|J|}{|I|}\notin\left[2^{-r},2^r\right]}}\left|\left\langle T^\alpha_\sigma\left(\triangle^\sigma_I f\right),\triangle^\omega_J g\right\rangle_\omega\right| \lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2+\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,*}_2}\,\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\,.$$

Lemma 25. *Suppose T^α is a standard fractional singular integral with $0\le\alpha<1$, that all of the cube pairs $(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{D}^\omega$ considered below are good, that $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g\in L^2(\omega)$, and that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are σ-Carleson and ω-Carleson collections respectively. Furthermore, suppose that for each pair of cubes $I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ and $J\in\mathcal{D}^\omega$, there are bounded functions $\beta_{I,J}$ and $\gamma_{I,J}$ supported in $I\setminus 2J$ and $J\setminus 2I$ respectively, satisfying*

$$\left\|\beta_{I,J}\right\|_\infty,\left\|\gamma_{I,J}\right\|_\infty\le1.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}(3.1)\qquad &\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^\omega\\ I\cap J=\emptyset \text{ and } |J|\le2^{-r}|I|}}\left|\left\langle T^\alpha_\sigma\left(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_I\mathbb{E}^\sigma_I f\right),\triangle^\omega_J g\right\rangle_\omega\right|\\ &+\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma\times\mathcal{G}\\ I\cap J=\emptyset \text{ and } |I|\le2^{-r}|J|}}\left|\left\langle T^\alpha_\sigma\left(\triangle^\sigma_I f\right),\gamma_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_J\mathbb{E}^\omega_J g\right\rangle_\omega\right|\\ \lesssim\;& \sqrt{\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2+\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,*}_2}\,\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\,,\end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^{\omega}\\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq|I|}}\left|\left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\left(\mathbf{1}_{I}\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}f\right),\triangle_{J}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|+\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}\times\mathcal{G}\\ 2^{-r}|J|\leq|I|\leq|J|}}\left|\left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\left(\triangle_{I}^{\sigma}f\right),\mathbf{1}_{J}\mathbb{E}_{J}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|$$
$$\lesssim\left(\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha}+\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha,*}+\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}^{\alpha}+\mathcal{A}_{2}^{\alpha,*}}\right)\left\Vert f\right\Vert_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\Vert g\right\Vert_{L^{2}(\omega)}.$$

Proof. We prove one of the estimates for the first term on the left side of (3.1). We split the sum into two pieces, namely a long-range sum where in addition $J\cap3I=\emptyset$, and a mid-range sum where in addition $J\subset3I\setminus I$. We illustrate the proof by estimating the long-range sum, namely we prove

$$\begin{aligned}A_{long-range} &\equiv \sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{D}^{\omega}\\ 3I\cap J=\emptyset\text{ and }|J|\leq2^{-r}|I|}}\left|\left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\left(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}f\right),\triangle_{J}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|\\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}^{\alpha}}\left\Vert f\right\Vert_{L^{2}(\sigma)}\left\Vert g\right\Vert_{L^{2}(\omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

We apply the Energy Lemma to estimate the inner product $\left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}$ using $\nu=\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}\sigma$ and $2J\cap supp\left(\beta_{I,J}\right)=\emptyset$. Since $|\nu|\leq\left\Vert\beta_{I,J}\right\Vert_{\infty}\mathbf{1}_{I}\sigma\leq\mathbf{1}_{I}\sigma$, the Energy Lemma applies to give,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right| &\lesssim \sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,|\nu|)\\ &\lesssim \sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mathbf{1}_{I}\sigma)\lesssim\sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequality $\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mathbf{1}_{I}\sigma)\lesssim\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}$, trivially valid when $3I\cap J=\emptyset$ and $|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\leq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}$. We may assume that $\left\Vert f\right\Vert_{L^{2}(\sigma)}^{2}=\left\Vert g\right\Vert_{L^{2}(\omega)}^{2}=1$. We then estimate

$$\begin{aligned}A_{long-range} &\leq \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J\,:\,|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\leq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left|\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}f\right|\left|\left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}(\beta_{I,J}\mathbf{1}_{I}),h_{J}^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|\\ &\lesssim \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J\,:\,|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\leq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left|\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}f\right|\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|\\ &\lesssim \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}f\right|^{2}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}\sum_{J\,:\,|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\leq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left(\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\delta}\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\\ &\quad+\sum_{J}\left|\langle g,h_{J}^{\omega}\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}\,:\,|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\leq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{-\delta}\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\frac{|J|}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\sqrt{|J|_{\omega}},\end{aligned}$$

where we have inserted the gain and loss factors $\left(\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\pm\delta}$ with $0<\delta<1$ to facilitate application of Schur's test. For each fixed $I\in\mathcal{F}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{J\,:\,|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\leq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\left(\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\delta}\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\\
\lesssim\;&\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k\delta}\left(\sum_{J\,:\,2^{k}|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}=|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\left|J\right|_{\omega}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\times\left(\sum_{J\,:\,2^{k}|J^{\frac{1}{n}}|=|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|}\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by

$$C\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k\delta}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(I,\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{|I|_{\sigma}}{|I|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}},$$

provided both $0\leq\alpha<1$ and $\delta>0$. For each fixed J we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}\,:\,|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\leq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\left(\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{-\delta}\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\frac{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\\
\lesssim\;&\sqrt{|J|_{\omega}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k(1-\delta)}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}\,:\,2^{k}|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}=|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\sqrt{|I|_{\sigma}}\\
\lesssim\;&\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k(1-\delta)}\left(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}\,:\,2^{k}|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}=|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\left|I\right|_{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\times\left(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}\,:\,2^{k}|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}=|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}:dist(I,J)\geq|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}{dist(I,J)^{n+1-\alpha}}\left|J\right|_{\omega}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k(1-\delta)}\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(2^{k}J,\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{|J|_{\omega}}{|2^{k}J|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
\lesssim\;&\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{-k(1-\delta)}\left(\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(2^{k}J,\sigma\right)\frac{|2^{k}J|_{\omega}}{|2^{k}J|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_{2}^{\alpha}},
\end{aligned}$$

provided both $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $\delta < 1$. With any fixed $0 < \delta < 1$ we obtain from the inequalities above that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{long-range} &\lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{F}} \left|\mathbb{E}_I^{\sigma} f\right|^2 |I|_{\sigma} \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2} + \sum_{J} \left|\langle g, h_J^{\omega} \rangle_{\omega}\right|^2 \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2 + \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \right) \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha}} = 2\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha}} \, \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} , \end{aligned}$$

since we assumed $\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} = \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} = 1$, and this completes the proof of our estimate.

The proofs for the other terms are similar. □

3.1. Outline of the proof of Theorem 3. The disjoint form $\mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f, g)$ in (1.1) is now easily controlled by the strong $\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha}$ condition and the cube testing conditions:

$$\left|\mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f, g)\right| \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha} + \mathfrak{T}_{\alpha,*} + \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha} + \mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha,*}} \right) \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} .$$

We will then show that after further corona decompositions, the near and far forms satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\mathsf{T}_{near}(f, g)\right| + \left|\mathsf{T}_{far}(f, g)\right| \\ &\lesssim \left(\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha} + \mathfrak{T}_{\alpha,*} + \sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha} + \mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha,*}} + \mathfrak{F}^{\alpha} + \mathfrak{F}^{\alpha,*} \right) \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)} . \end{aligned}$$

The bulk of the work in estimating the far form T_{far} here is taken up in proving the generalization of the Interwining Proposition in Section 4 of Part 1. To estimate the near form T_{near} here, we use the generalized Intertwining Proposition to reduce the generalized *bi*linear minimal bounded fluctuation condition (4.10) to a similar inequality generalizing (1.1), but for a *non*linear form B_{stop} that is esssentially an analogue of the stopping term introduced by NTV in [**NTV4**]. Then we extend the argument of M. Lacey in [**Lac**] to standard α-fractional Calderón-Zygmund operators in higher dimensions, using the Monotonicity Property and energy conditions, which hold because of our side assumption that the functional energy conditions hold. This will complete the proof of Theorem 3.

CHAPTER 9

Adapting the one-dimensional indicator/interval argument

Here we adapt the arguments we need from Part 1 to higher dimensions.

1. Intertwining proposition

The results in Part 1 on intertwining estimates and functional energy extend almost verbatim to our setting in higher dimensions. We summarize here the main consequences for our fractional Calderón-Zygmund operator T^{α}, highlight the places where some minor change is required, and omit the remainder of the routine but lengthy verification of the details. Recall the definition of the 'mixed' form,

$$\mathsf{B}_{mix}^{\alpha}\left(f,g\right) \equiv \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{G\sim F}\sum_{\substack{(I,J)\in\mathcal{C}_F^{\sigma}\times\mathcal{C}_G^{\omega}\\ I\Subset G'\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}(G)}} \left\langle \triangle_I^{\sigma} f, T_{\omega}^{\alpha}\triangle_J^{\omega} g\right\rangle_{\sigma},$$

where we take the liberty of writing simply T_{ω}^{α} to denote the dual operator $\left(\left(T^{\alpha}\right)^{*}\right)_{\omega}=\left(T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\right)^{*}$. We now show that the functional energy inequality (4.1) suffices to prove an α-fractional n-dimensional analogue of the Intertwining Proposition.

Proposition 8. *Let $f=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F^{\sigma}}^{\sigma}f$ and $g=\sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G^{\omega}}^{\omega}g$ be a parallel Calderón-Zygmund corona decomposition for $f\in L^2\left(\sigma\right)$ and $g\in L^2\left(\omega\right)$. Then*

(1.1)

$$\left|\sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}}\left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F^{\sigma}}^{\sigma}f,\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_G^{\omega}}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|+\left|\mathsf{B}_{mix}^{\alpha}\left(f,g\right)\right|\lesssim\left(\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha}+\sqrt{\mathcal{A}_2^{\alpha}}+\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha}\right)\left\|f\right\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left\|g\right\|_{L^2(\omega)},$$

where $\mathfrak{T}_{\alpha}$ is the cube testing constant for T_{σ}^{α}. There is of course a dual formulation with $F\subset G$.

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as in the one dimensional case since we have the Monotonicity Lemma at our disposal. We content ourselves with a review of those portions of the proof in the case of dimension $n=1$ that involve either the Monotonicity Lemma, functional energy or the energy condition. We begin with the estimate (1.10) at the end of the proof in Part 1. With notation as in that proof but with the obvious modifications to higher dimension, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g} &= \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}}\left|\widehat{g}^{\omega}\left(J\right)\right|\sum_{k=1}^{n}h_J^{\omega,e_k};\\ \widehat{g}^{\omega}\left(J\right) &\equiv \left\{\left\langle g,h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right\}_{a\in\Gamma_n} \text{ and } \left|\widehat{g}^{\omega}\left(J\right)\right|=\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle g,h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\|\widetilde{g}\|_{L^2(\omega)} \approx \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}$ and that $\widehat{g}^{\omega}(J,a) \geq 0$ for all $J \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ and $a \in \Gamma_n$. If we denote by J^* the unique cube in $\mathcal{M}(F)$ containing J, then from the Monotonicity Lemma we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.2)\qquad & \left| \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \int \mathbf{R}_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\left(f_{G(J),corona}^{\natural} \right) \left(\triangle_J^{\omega} g \right) \omega \right| \\
\leq & \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \left| \widehat{g}^{\omega}(J) \right| \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ G(J)\subset F \\ (F,G(J))\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}} \sum_{a\in\Gamma_n} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{R}_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\left(\left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F}^{\sigma}|f| \right) \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F} \right), h_J^{\omega,a} \right\rangle_{\omega} \right| \\
\lesssim & \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \left| \widehat{\widetilde{g}}^{\omega}(J) \right| \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ G(J)\subset F \\ (F,G(J))\in\mathsf{Far}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F}^{\sigma}|f| \right) \frac{1}{|J^*|} \mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J^*, \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F}\sigma \right) \widehat{X}^{\omega}(J) \\
= & \sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{M}(K)} \left\langle x, \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}:\ J\subset J^* \\ \pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K}} \triangle_J^{\omega}\widetilde{g} \right\rangle_{\omega} \frac{1}{|J^*|} \mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J^*, \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}:\ K\subsetneqq F} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F}^{\sigma}|f| \right) \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}}F\setminus F}\sigma \right) \\
\leq & \sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{M}(K)} \left\langle \frac{x}{|J^*|}, \mathbf{1}_{J^*} g_K \right\rangle_{\omega} \mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J^*, \mathcal{M}_{\sigma} f \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the collection of functions

$$g_K \equiv \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega} \\ \pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K}} \triangle_J^{\omega}\widetilde{g}, \qquad K \in \mathcal{F},$$

is $\mathcal{F}$-adapted as in Definition 17 above. Indeed, for $J \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J) = K$ we have $\widehat{g_K}(J,a) = \widehat{\widetilde{g}}(J,a) \geq 0$, and the orthogonality property

$$(1.3)\qquad \left\langle g_K, g_{K'} \right\rangle_{\omega} = 0, \qquad K, K' \in \mathcal{F},$$

holds since if $J \in \mathcal{C}_G$, $J' \in \mathcal{C}_{G'}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}G \neq \pi_{\mathcal{F}}G'$, then $J \neq J'$. Note also that we have the property

$$\left\langle \frac{x}{|J^*|}, \mathbf{1}_{J^*} g_K \right\rangle_{\omega} = \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}:\ J\subset J^* \\ \pi_{\mathcal{F}}G(J)=K}} \left| \langle g, h_J^{\omega} \rangle_{\omega} \right| \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left\langle \frac{x}{|J^*|}, h_J^{\omega,e_k} \right\rangle_{\omega} \geq 0.$$

Finally, property (3) of Definition 17 holds with overlap constant $C = 2$. Indeed, if $J^* \subset I \subset F$ with $J^* \in \mathcal{J}^*(F)$, there are two possibilities: either (i) $G(J^*) \subset I$ or (ii) $I \subsetneqq G(J^*)$. In the first possibility we have $F = F_{G(J^*)}$ and it is now easily seen that the J^* in case (i) are pairwise disjoint. In the second possibility, we have $G(J^*) = G(I)$, and again it is easily seen that the J^* in case (ii) are pairwise disjoint.

Since $\mathcal{F}$ is σ-Carleson, we can now apply the functional energy condition (4.1) to the right side of (1.10) with the choice $h = \mathcal{M}_{\sigma} f$. We have the maximal function estimate,

$$\|h\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)},$$

and so altogether we obtain that the right hand side of (1.2) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{J^*\in\mathcal{M}(K)}\left\langle\frac{x}{|J^*|},\mathbf{1}_{J^*}g_K\right\rangle_\omega \mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J^*,\mathcal{M}_\sigma f\right)\\
\leq\ & \mathfrak{F}^\alpha\|h\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\left[\sum_{K\in\mathcal{F}}\|g_K\|^2_{L^2(\omega)}\right]^{1/2}\\
\lesssim\ & \mathfrak{F}^\alpha\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|\widetilde{g}\|_{L^2(\omega)}\lesssim\mathfrak{F}^\alpha\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

by (4.1) and (1.3).

Similar considerations apply to the analogous inequalities (1.15) and (2.15) for the mixed form $\mathsf{B}^\alpha_{mix}(f,g)$ and the general stopping data case, and show that the analogues of these inequalities hold assuming only $\mathfrak{F}^\alpha$, $\sqrt{\mathcal{A}^\alpha_2}$ and $\mathfrak{T}_\alpha$. □

We will also need the following generalization of the Intertwining Proposition to parallel corona splittings that use general stopping data. The proof is the same as in Part 1 with the modifications described in the proof above.

Proposition 9. *Let*

$$\langle T^\alpha_\sigma(f),g\rangle_\omega=\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g)+\mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f,g)+\mathsf{T}_{far}(f,g)$$

be a parallel corona splitting as in (0.6) of the bilinear form $\langle T^\alpha_\sigma f,g\rangle_\omega$ *with stopping data* $\mathcal{F}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *for* f *and* g *respectively. Then (1.1) holds.*

2. Bounded fluctuation decomposition

As in Part 1, we apply different corona decompositions in succession to the function $f\in L^2(\sigma)$, gaining structure with each application, but only two are needed now instead of three; first to bounded fluctuation for f, and then to regularizing the weight σ. The same is done for $g\in L^2(\omega)$. Continuing as in Part 1, we combine these decompositions for f and g into a *double* parallel corona splitting to which the Iterated Corona Proposition and the Intertwining Proposition apply. We begin with the first corona decomposition that will produce functions of bounded fluctuation. We remark that there is no theory of *minimal* bounded fluctuation in higher dimensions, and hence no possibility of obtaining the associated corona decomposition. However, the stopping time and recursion of M. Lacey [**Lac**] circumvent this omission.

Recall Definition 22. Given $\gamma>1$, a cube $K\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma$ and a function f supported on K, we say that f is a γ-*simple* function of *bounded fluctuation* on K, written $f\in\mathcal{SBF}^{(\gamma)}_\sigma(K)$, if there is a pairwise disjoint collection $\mathcal{K}$ of $\mathcal{D}^\sigma$-subcubes of K such that

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= \sum_{K'\in\mathcal{K}}a_{K'}\mathbf{1}_{K'},\\
a_{K'} &> \gamma,\qquad K'\in\mathcal{K},\\
\frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I f\sigma &\leq 1,\qquad I\in\widehat{\mathcal{K}},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}}=\left\{I\in\mathcal{D}^\sigma:I\subset K\text{ and }I\supsetneqq K'\text{ for some }K'\in\mathcal{K}\right\}.$$

Using the facts that $\frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I |f|\,\sigma \leq 1$ for $I \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I |f|\,\sigma > \gamma$ for $I \in \mathcal{K}$, it is easy to see that the collection $\mathcal{K}$ is uniquely determined by the simple function f of bounded fluctuation, so we will typically write $\mathcal{K}_f$ for this collection when $f \in \mathcal{SBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(K)$. Note that functions in $\mathcal{SBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(K)$, unlike those in $\mathcal{BF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(K)$, do *not* have vanishing mean.

LEMMA 26. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is a stopping collection for $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ with Calderón-Zygmund stopping constant $C_0 \geq 4$. Given $\gamma > 1$, there is for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ a decomposition,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f &= \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right)_1 + \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right)_2 ; \\ \left|\frac{1}{(C_0\gamma+\gamma+1)\,\mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f|}\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right)_1\right| &\leq \mathbf{1}_F , \\ \frac{1}{(C_0+1)\,\mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f|}\left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right)_2 &\in \mathcal{GBF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(F) . \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f &= (C_0\gamma+\gamma+1)\left(\mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f|\right)\ h_0 + (C_0+1)\left(\mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f|\right)\ h_1 ; \\ h_i &\in \mathcal{BF}_\sigma^{(\gamma)}(F) , \qquad i = 1, 2 . \end{aligned}$$

The proof is virtually identical to that in Part 1, and we repeat it here in $\mathbb{R}^n$ due to its significance.

PROOF. To obtain (2.1), fix $F \in \mathcal{F}$ for the moment, and write

$$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f = \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f + \mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f ,$$

where

$$\widehat{F} \equiv F \setminus \widetilde{F} \text{ and } \widetilde{F} \equiv \bigcup_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}(F)} F' .$$

Then if $x \in \widehat{F}$ we have

$$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}(F)}^\sigma f(x) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}_F} \triangle_I^\sigma f(x) = \mathbb{E}_{K(x)}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_F^\sigma f ,$$

where $K(x)$ is the smallest child of any cube in the corona $\mathcal{C}_F$ that contains x. Thus

$$\left|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f(x)\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x)\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}_{K(x)}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_F^\sigma f\right|\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x) \leq (C_0+1)\ \mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f|\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x) , \tag{2.2}$$

where C_0 is the Calderón-Zygmund stopping constant, and

$$\mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f = \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}(F)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{F'}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_F^\sigma f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'} .$$

Now let

$$\mathfrak{C}_{big}(F) = \left\{F' \in \mathfrak{C}(F) : \left|\mathbb{E}_{F'}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_F^\sigma f\right| > (C_0\gamma+\gamma+1)\,\mathbb{E}_F^\sigma |f|\right\} ,$$

set $\mathfrak{C}_{small}(F) = \mathfrak{C}(F) \setminus \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)$, and then define

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right)_1 &= \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f(x) + \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{small}(F)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{F'}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_F^\sigma f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'} , \\ \left(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}_F}^\sigma f\right)_2 &= \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{F'}^\sigma f - \mathbb{E}_F^\sigma f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'} , \end{aligned}$$

to obtain the decomposition (1.1).

Indeed, from (2.2) and the definition of $\mathfrak{C}_{small}(F)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_1\right| &\leq \max\left\{\left\|\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f(x)\ \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{F}}(x)\right\|_{L^\infty(\sigma)}, \sup_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{small}(F)} \left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F f\right|\right\} \\ &\leq \left(C_0\gamma+\gamma+1\right)\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F\left|f\right|. \end{aligned}$$

To see that $\frac{1}{(C_0+1)\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f|}\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2 \in \mathcal{GBF}_\sigma(F)$, take $I\subset F$ such that $I \supsetneqq F'$ for some $F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I \left|\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2\right|\sigma &= \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I \left|\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{big}(F):\ F'\subset I} \left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'}\right|\sigma \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f| + \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I\left(\sum_{F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{big}(F):\ F'\subset I}\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{F'}|f|\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{F'}\right)\sigma \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f| + \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}\int_I |f|\,\sigma \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f| + \frac{1}{|I|_\sigma}C_0\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f|\,|I|_\sigma \leq \left(C_0+1\right)\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f|, \end{aligned}$$

where C_0 is the Calderón-Zygmund stopping constant. On the other hand, for $F'\in\mathfrak{C}_{big}(F)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|F'|_\sigma}\int_{F'}\left|\left(\mathsf{P}^\sigma_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right)_2\right|\sigma &= \left|\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{F'} f - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F f\right| > \left(C_0\gamma+\gamma+1\right)\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f| - \mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f| \\ &= \left(C_0+1\right)\left(\mathbb{E}^\sigma_F|f|\right)\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

□

3. The energy corona and stopping form decomposition

In order to proceed with *cube* size splitting we must also impose an energy corona decomposition as in [**NTV4**] and [**LaSaUr**]. Recall the energy $\mathsf{E}(I,\omega)$ of a measure ω on a dyadic cube I is given by

$$\mathsf{E}(I,\omega)^2 = \frac{1}{|I|_\omega}\int_I\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}-\mathbb{E}^\omega_I\mathbf{x}}{|I|}\right)^2 d\omega(x) = \frac{1}{|I|_\omega}\sum_{J\subset I}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle\frac{\mathbf{x}}{|I|}, h^{\omega,a}_J\right\rangle_\omega\right|^2,$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that the Haar functions $\{h^{\omega,a}_J\}_{J\subset I,\ a\in\Gamma_n}$ form an orthonormal basis of $\left\{f\in L^2(\omega) : \text{supp} f\subset I \text{ and } \int f d\omega = 0\right\}$. Recall also that $J\Subset I$ means $J\subset I$, $|J|\leq 2^{-r}|I|$ and that J is good.

Definition 23. *Given a cube S_0, define $\mathcal{S}(S_0)$ to be the maximal subcubes $I\subset S_0$ such that if $\mathcal{M}(I)$ is the partition of I into maximal deeply embedded subcubes $J\Subset I$, then*

$$\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(I)}|J|_\omega\,\mathsf{E}(J,\omega)^2\,\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{S_0}\sigma\right)^2 \geq 10\left(\mathcal{E}^\alpha\right)^2\ |I|_\sigma, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$ is the best constant in the energy condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty |I_i|_\omega\,\mathsf{E}(I_i,\omega)^2\,\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(I_i,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 \leq \left(\mathcal{E}^\alpha\right)^2\ |I|_\sigma,$$

where $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *is any subpartition of* I*. Then define the* σ*-energy stopping cubes of* S_0 *to be the collection* $\mathcal{S}=\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{S}_n$ *where* $\mathcal{S}_0=\mathcal{S}(S_0)$ *and* $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}=\bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}_n}\mathcal{S}(S)$ *for* $n\geq 0$*.*

From the energy condition we obtain the σ-Carleson estimate

$$\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}:\ S\subset I}|S|_{\sigma}\leq 2\,|I|_{\sigma}\,,\qquad I\in\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}. \tag{3.2}$$

We emphasize that this collection of stopping times depends only on S_0 and the weight pair (σ,ω), and not on any functions at hand. There is also a dual definition of energy stopping times $\mathcal{T}$ that satisfies an ω-Carleson estimate

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}:\ T\subset J}|T|_{\omega}\leq 2\,|J|_{\omega}\,,\qquad J\in\mathcal{D}^{\omega}. \tag{3.3}$$

Finally, we record the reason for introducing energy stopping times. If

$$X^{\alpha}(\mathcal{C}_S)^2\equiv\sup_{I\in\mathcal{C}_S}\frac{1}{|I|_{\sigma}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(I)}|J|_{\omega}\,\mathsf{E}(J,\omega)^2\,\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}(J,\mathbf{1}_S\sigma)^2 \tag{3.4}$$

is (the square of) the α-*stopping energy* of the weight pair (σ,ω) with respect to the corona $\mathcal{C}_S$, then we have the *stopping energy bounds*

$$X^{\alpha}(\mathcal{C}_S)\leq\sqrt{10}\mathcal{E}^{\alpha},\qquad S\in\mathcal{S}, \tag{3.5}$$

where the energy constant $\mathcal{E}^{\alpha}$ is controlled by our side assumption that the functional energy constant $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha}$ is finite. Later we will introduce refinements of the stopping energy that depend as well on the Haar supports of the functions $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ and $g\in L^2(\omega)$ at hand.

4. The parallel corona splitting of the double corona decompositions

In Part 1 we used a *triple* parallel corona in order to further reduce matters to *minimal* bounded fluctuation. But in order to apply Lacey's argument from [**Lac**] there is no need for miminal bounded fluctuation, and in any case, as mentioned above, there is no theory of minimal bounded fluctuation in higher dimensions. Here is our double corona decomposition of $f\in L^2(\sigma)$. We first apply the Calderón-Zygmund corona decomposition to the function $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ obtain

$$f=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F}f.$$

We then finish our double corona decomposition of f in (4.1) as follows. For each fixed $F\in\mathcal{F}$, construct the *energy* corona decomposition $\{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_S\}_{S\in\mathcal{S}(F)}$ corresponding to the weight pair (σ,ω) with top interval $S_0=F$, as given in Definition 11.

We then define stopping data $\left\{\alpha_{\mathcal{S}(F)}(S)\right\}_{S\in\mathcal{S}(F)}$ for the function $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F}f$ relative to the stopping times $\mathcal{S}(F)$ as follows. For $F\in\mathcal{F}$ define

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{S}(F)}(S)=2\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(F)\ \text{ for } S\in\mathcal{S}(F)\,.$$

Just as in Part 1, properties (2) and (4) of Definition 1 are immediate.

At this point we apply Lemma 1 to obtain iterated stopping times $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ and iterated stopping data $\left\{\alpha_{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})}(S)\right\}_{S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})}$. This gives us the following *double corona decomposition* of f,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f &= \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(F)} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{S}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f \\
&= \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(F)} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{S}\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f = \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{S}} f,
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.1}
$$

as well as a corresponding double corona decomposition of g,

$$
\begin{aligned}
g &= \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}} g = \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}(G)} \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{T}} \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}} g \\
&= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}(G)} \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{T}\cap\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}} g = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{G})} \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{T}} g.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.2}
$$

We emphasize that the energy coronas $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are independent of each other, in contrast to the usual constructions in [**NTV4**] and [**LaSaUr**], where $\mathcal{T}$ is derived from $\mathcal{S}$.

Now we apply the *parallel* corona splitting as in (1.1) corresponding to the double corona decompositions (4.1) and (4.2). We obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma} f, g\right\rangle_{\omega} &= \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \sum_{G\in\mathcal{G}} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{S}} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{F}} f\right), \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{T}} \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{G}} g\right\rangle_{\omega} \\
&= \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma} \mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{S}} f, \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{T}} g\right\rangle_{\omega} \\
&\equiv \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}} \sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_{A}} f\right), \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_{B}} g\right\rangle_{\omega} \\
&= \mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g) + \mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f,g) + \mathsf{T}_{far}(f,g),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ and } \mathcal{B} \equiv \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{G})
$$

are the double stopping collections for f and g respectively. We are relabeling the double coronas as $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ here so as to minimize confusion when we apply the various different estimates associated with each of the two corona decompositions of f and g. We now record the two main facts proved above.

LEMMA 27. *The data $\mathcal{A}$ and $\{\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(A)\}_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ satisfy properties (1), (2), (3) and (4) in Definition 1, and similarly for the data $\mathcal{B}$ and $\{\beta_{\mathcal{B}}(B)\}_{B\in\mathcal{B}}$.*

Thus we can apply the Iterated Corona Proposition 1 to the parallel double corona decomposition (1.1):

$$
\left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma} f, g\right\rangle_{\omega} = \mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g) + \mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f,g) + \mathsf{T}_{far}(f,g).
$$

The result is that

$$
\left|\mathsf{T}_{far}(f,g)\right| \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}_{\alpha}\right) \|f\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}.
$$

Moreover, Lemma 2 implies

$$
\left|\mathsf{T}_{disjoint}(f,g)\right| \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}_{\alpha}\right) \|f\|_{L^{2}(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^{2}(\omega)},
$$

and so it remains to deal only with the near form $\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g)$.

We first further decompose $\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g)$ into lower and upper parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g) &= \left\{ \sum_{\substack{(A,B)\in \mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})\\ B\subset A}} + \sum_{\substack{(A,B)\in \mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})\\ A\subset B}} \right\} \int T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_A} f\right) \ \left(\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}_B} g\right)\omega \\
&= \mathsf{T}_{near\ lower}(f,g) + \mathsf{T}_{near\ upper}(f,g)\,; \\
\mathsf{T}_{near\ lower}(f,g) &= \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_A} f, \mathsf{Q}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^{\omega}_A} g \right\rangle_{\omega}\,; \\
\mathsf{Q}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^{\omega}_A} &\equiv \sum_{J\in\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_A} \triangle^{\omega}_J \text{ where } \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}^{\omega}_A \equiv \bigcup_{\substack{B\in\mathcal{B}:\ B\subset A\\ (A,B)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})}} \mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have that $\mathsf{Q}^{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_A} = \sum_{\substack{B\in\mathcal{B}:\ B\subset A\\ (A,B)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B})}} \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}_B}$ is the projection onto all of the coronas $\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_B$ for which B is 'near and below' A. By symmetry, it suffices to consider the lower near form $\mathsf{T}_{near\ lower}(f,g)$. For this term we need a further decomposition and another application of functional energy.

5. A further application of functional energy and cube size splitting

In order to continue the proof of Theorem 3, we make a further decomposition of the near term $\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g)$ in (1.1). This decomposition occurs in Lacey [**Lac**], as well as in unpublished papers of the authors and M. Lacey where the term $\mathsf{T}^{para}_{near\ lower}(f,g)$ below is referred to as the 'bottom term', and was handled there by functional energy (aka strong energy inequality) at a time before it was known that functional energy was controlled by $\mathcal{A}_2$ and testing in dimension $n=1$. We write $\mathsf{T}_{near}(f,g) = \mathsf{T}_{near\ lower}(f,g) + \mathsf{T}_{near\ upper}(f,g)$ where

$$\mathsf{T}_{near\ lower}(f,g) = \sum_{\substack{(F,G)\in\mathsf{Near}(\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G})\\ G\subset F}} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right), \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}_G} g\right\rangle_{\omega},$$

and the sum above is over pairs (F,G) in $\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}$ such that $G\vdash F$, i.e.

$$G\subset F \text{ and there is no } F_1\in\mathcal{F}\setminus\{F\} \text{ with } G\subset F_1\subset F.$$

Now for $G\vdash F$ we further decompose

$$\mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}_G} g \equiv \sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}_G} \triangle^{\omega}_J g = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_G\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} \triangle^{\omega}_J g + \sum_{J\in\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_G\setminus\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} \triangle^{\omega}_J g = \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_G\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} g + \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_G\setminus\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} g\ ,$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{T}_{near\ lower}(f,g) &= \sum_{G\vdash F} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right), \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}_G} g\right\rangle_{\omega} \\
&= \sum_{G\vdash F} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right), \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_G\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} g\right\rangle_{\omega} + \sum_{G\vdash F} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right), \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_G\setminus\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} g\right\rangle_{\omega} \\
&\equiv \mathsf{T}^{main}_{near\ lower}(f,g) + \mathsf{T}^{para}_{near\ lower}(f,g)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The form $\mathsf{T}^{para}_{near\ lower}(f,g)$ can be handled by the functional energy condition by applying the Intertwining Proposition. The remaining form

$$\mathsf{T}^{main}_{near\ lower}(f,g) = \sum_{G\vdash F} \left\langle T^{\alpha}_{\sigma}\left(\mathsf{P}^{\sigma}_{\mathcal{C}_F} f\right), \mathsf{P}^{\omega}_{\mathcal{C}^{\omega}_G\cap\mathcal{C}^{\sigma}_F} g\right\rangle_{\omega} \tag{5.1}$$

retains the bounded averages condition from the telescoping property of Haar projections. Indeed, the children F' of F do *not* occur among the cubes I_J for $I \in \mathcal{C}_F^\sigma$ and $J \in \mathcal{C}_G^\omega$ with $J \Subset I$. Recall that I_J is the unique child of I containing J.

5.1. Cube size splitting. At this point we apply the cube size splitting of NTV described in dimension $n = 1$ in Section 6 of Part 1. The arguments there carry over easily to higher dimensions and reduce matters to the stopping form

$$\mathsf{B}_{stop}(f,g) \equiv \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{J:\ J\Subset I \text{ and } I_J \notin \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{I_J}^\sigma \bigtriangleup_I^\sigma f\right) \left\langle T_\sigma^\alpha \mathbf{1}_{S\setminus I_J}, \bigtriangleup_J^\omega g\right\rangle_\omega \equiv \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}} \mathsf{B}_{stop}^I(f,g). \tag{5.2}$$

It is to the form $\mathsf{B}_{stop}^I(f,g)$ that we will apply the argument of M. Lacey in [**Lac**] in the next chapter to prove the inequality

$$\left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^I(f,g)\right| \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}\ , \qquad I \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{5.3}$$

The bounded averages of f in $\mathsf{B}_{stop}(f,g)$ will prove crucial in the Straddling Lemma 29 below.

CHAPTER 10

The stopping time and recursion of M. Lacey

In this final chapter we reproduce the argument of M. Lacey in [**Lac**] in the setting of a general α-fractional Calderón-Zygmund operator T^{α} in $\mathbb{R}^n$ using the Monontonicity Lemma. While this reproduction is essentially verbatim, the argument is subtle and technical, and we give a detailed account of Lacey's argument below, along with a number of cosmetic changes.

1. Additivity of projections

Recall that the energy condition

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |J_n|_{\omega} \,\mathsf{E}\left(J_n,\omega\right)^2 \mathrm{P}\left(J_n,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 \lesssim \left(\mathfrak{NTV}\right)|I|_{\sigma}\,, \qquad \dot{\bigcup}_{n=1}^{\infty} J_n \subset I,$$

could not be used in the NTV argument, because the set functional $J \to |J|_{\omega}\,\mathsf{E}\left(J,\omega\right)^2$ failed to be superadditive. On the other hand, the pivotal condition of NTV,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |J_n|_{\omega} \,\mathrm{P}\left(J_n,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)^2 \lesssim |I|_{\sigma}\,, \qquad \dot{\bigcup}_{n=1}^{\infty} J_n \subset I,$$

succeeded in the NTV argument because the set functional $J \to |J|_{\omega}$ is trivially superadditive, indeed additive. The final piece of the argument needed to prove the NTV conjecture was found by M. Lacey in [**Lac**], and amounts to first replacing the additivity of the functional $J \to |J|_{\omega}$ with the additivity of the projection functional

$$\mathcal{H} \to \left\|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}} x\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 = \int \left|\sum_{K\in\mathcal{H}} \left\langle x, h_K^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega} h_K^{\omega}\right|^2 d\omega = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{H}} \left|\left\langle x, h_K^{\omega}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^2,$$

defined on subsets $\mathcal{H}$ of the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}$, which was introduced above in the definition (2.2) of the generalized energy $\mathsf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(J,\omega\right)^2$. Then a stopping time argument relative to this more subtle functional, together with a clever recursion, constitute the main new ingredients in Lacey's argument [**Lac**].

We now complete our extension of the NTV characterization for the Hilbert transform to the vector of α-Riesz transforms in n-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, using the Monotonicity Lemma and energy conditions, which follow from our side assumption that the functional energy constants are finite. Recall that we earlier combined this with an extension of the double corona decomposition in Part 1, and we are now left with adapting the clever stopping time and recursion used to obtain the NTV conjecture for the Hilbert transform by M. Lacey in [**Lac**]. This adaptation is virtually verbatim, except for cosmetic changes in the argument. The presence of the fractional parameter plays little role in this argument, save through its appearance in the fractional energy condition.

To begin the extension to a more general Calderón-Zygmund operator T^{α}, we also recall the stopping energy defined in (3.4), but generalized to higher dimensions by

$$X^{\alpha}\left(\mathcal{C}_A\right)^2 \equiv \sup_{I\in\mathcal{C}_A}\frac{1}{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{M}(I)}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J,\mathbf{1}_A\sigma\right)}{\left|J\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\left\|\mathsf{P}_J^{\omega}\mathbf{x}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 .$$

What now follows is a near verbatim adaptation to higher dimensions of the arguments of M. Lacey in [**Lac**].

2. The stopping energy

The following generalization of the stopping energies $\boldsymbol{X}^A\left(f,g\right)$ and $X\left(\mathcal{C}_A\right)$ will be used below. Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a subset of the product space $\mathcal{D}\times\mathcal{D}$ of pairs of dyadic cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We say that $\mathcal{P}$ is an *admissible* collection of pairs for a dyadic cube A if

- $J\Subset I\subset A$ for every $(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}$,
- if $I_1\subset I_2$ and both $(I_1,J)\in\mathcal{P}$ and $(I_2,J)\in\mathcal{P}$, then $(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}$ for every I in the geodesic $[I_1,I_2]=\{I\in\mathcal{D}:I_1\subset I\subset I_2\}$.

For an admissible collection $\mathcal{P}$ let $\pi_1\mathcal{P}$ and $\pi_2\mathcal{P}$ be the cubes in the first and second components of the pairs respectively, and set

$$\pi_2^I\mathcal{P}\equiv\left\{J\in\pi_2\mathcal{P}:\ J\subset I\right\}.$$

Note in particular that $\pi_2^I\mathcal{P}$ could be much larger than the projection $\pi_2\mathcal{P}^I$ of the collection of pairs $\mathcal{P}^I\equiv\left\{J\in\pi_2\mathcal{P}:\ (I,J)\in\mathcal{P}\right\}$ onto the second coordinate. The definition of the $\mathcal{P}$-stopping energy on A is motivated by the Monotonicity Lemma and the energy condition,

$$\mathcal{E}^{\alpha}\lesssim\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha},$$

which holds because of our *assumption* that the functional energy constant $\mathfrak{F}^{\alpha}$ is finite. Recall that $\mathcal{E}^{\alpha}$ is defined in (4.2) by

$$\left(\mathcal{E}^{\alpha}\right)^2=\sup_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\frac{1}{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}\sup_{\{I_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}=\mathcal{M}(I)}\sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(I_r,\mathbf{1}_I\sigma\right)}{\left|I_r\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{J\subset I_r}\widehat{X}^{\omega}\left(J\right)^2 .$$

We now define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_A^{\alpha}\left(\mathcal{P}\right)^2 &\equiv \sup_{I\in\pi_1\mathcal{P}}\frac{1}{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(I,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I}\sigma\right)}{\left|I\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{J\in\pi_2^I\mathcal{P}}\widehat{X}^{\omega}\left(J\right)^2 \\ &\approx \sup_{I\in\pi_1\mathcal{P}}\frac{1}{\left|I\right|_{\sigma}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(I,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I}\sigma\right)}{\left|I\right|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\left\|\mathsf{P}_{\pi_2\mathcal{P}}\mathbf{x}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 ,\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where we recall that a projection $\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$ on $\mathbf{x}$ satisfies

$$\left\|\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}\mathbf{x}\right\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle x_{\ell},h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^2\approx\sum_{J\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left|\left\langle x_{\ell},h_J^{\omega,e_{\ell}}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^2\approx\sum_{J\in\mathcal{H}}\widehat{X}^{\omega}\left(J\right)^2 .$$

REMARK 15. *This functional* $\mathcal{E}_A^{\alpha}\left(\mathcal{P}\right)$ *is the* size *of* $\mathcal{P}$ *in Lacey* [**Lac**] *when* $n=1$ *and* $\alpha=0$.

Note that by the stopping energy control for the form $\mathsf{B}_{stop}(f,g)$ associated with A, we have that the energy constant $\mathcal{E}^{\alpha}$ bounds $\mathcal{E}_{A}^{\alpha}(\mathcal{P})$, so that we have the following inequality.

Lemma 28.

$$\mathcal{E}_{A}^{\alpha}(\mathcal{P})^{2}\lesssim(\mathcal{E}^{\alpha})^{2}\ .$$

Now define an atomic measure $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ in the upper half space $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n+1}$ by

$$\omega_{\mathcal{P}}\equiv\sum_{J\in\pi_{2}\mathcal{P}}\widehat{X}^{\omega}(J)^{2}\ \delta_{(c_{J},|J|)},$$

so that

$$\omega_{\mathcal{P}}\approx\sum_{J\in\pi_{2}\mathcal{P}}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_{n}}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\left|\left\langle x^{\ell},h_{J}^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_{\omega}\right|^{2}\ \delta_{(c_{J},|J|)}.$$

Then if we define the tent $\mathbf{T}(K)$ over a cube K to be the convex hull of the n-cube $K\times\{0\}$ and the point $(c_{K},|K|)\in\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n+1}$, we have

$$\omega_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{T}(K))=\sum_{J\in\pi_{2}^{K}\mathcal{P}}\widehat{X}^{\omega}(J)^{2}.$$

Thus we can rewrite the $\mathcal{P}$-stopping energy (2.1) as

$$\mathcal{E}_{A}^{\alpha}(\mathcal{P})^{2}\equiv\sup_{I\in\pi_{1}\mathcal{P}}\frac{1}{|I|_{\sigma}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(I,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I}\sigma\right)}{|I|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{2}\omega_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{T}(I)).\tag{2.2}$$

Remark 16. *In the case* $\alpha=0$ *and* $n=1$*, when written in the form*

$$\mathcal{E}_{A}(\mathcal{P})^{2}\equiv\sup_{I\in\pi_{1}\mathcal{P}}\frac{\mathrm{P}\left(I,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I}\sigma\right)}{|I|_{\sigma}}\left\{\frac{\mathrm{P}\left(I,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I}\sigma\right)\omega_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{T}(I))}{|I|^{2}}\right\},$$

the $\mathcal{P}$*-stopping energy (2.1) can be viewed as a strong variant of the* A_2 *condition. Indeed, the ratio inside the braces is a product of a* σ*-meaure quantity* $\mathrm{P}\left(I,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I}\sigma\right)$ *associated with* I *and an* ω*-measure quantity* $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{T}(I))$ *associated with* I*, all divided by the square of the Lebesgue measure of* I*. The factor outside the braces measures the dispersion of* σ *outside* I*.*

3. The recursion

If $\mathcal{P}$ is an admissible collection for a dyadic cube A, define the corresponding stopping form $\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}=\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P},A}$ as in B_{stop}^{I} in (5.2) by

$$\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}(f,g)\equiv\sum_{(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\mathbb{E}_{I}^{\sigma}\bigtriangleup_{\pi I}^{\sigma}f\right)\ \left\langle T_{\sigma}^{\alpha}\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I},\bigtriangleup_{J}^{\omega}g\right\rangle_{\omega},$$

where πI is the parent of I in the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}$. In the notation for $\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}$,we are omitting dependence on the parameter α, and to avoid clutter, we will often do so from now on when the dependence on α is inconsequential. Note that in the sum above we have reindexed the notation for the parent/child pair (I,I_J) to $(\pi I,I)$. We are also suppressing the sum in $a\in\Gamma_n$ that parameterizes the 2^n-1 Haar functions associated with each J. Following Lacey [**Lac**], we now claim this proposition, which easily proves the inequality (5.3) by recursion, followed by an application of Lemma 28. Let

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}} \equiv \sup_{\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}=\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}=1} \left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}(f,g)\right|$$

denote the norm of the form $\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}$.

Proposition 10. *(This is the Size Lemma in Lacey* [**Lac**]*) Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be an* admissible *collection of pairs for a dyadic cube A. Then we can decompose $\mathcal{P}$ into two disjoint collections $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^{big}\dot{\cup}\mathcal{P}^{small}$, and further decompose $\mathcal{P}^{small}$ into pairwise disjoint collections $\mathcal{P}_1^{small}, \mathcal{P}_2^{small} ... \mathcal{P}_\ell^{small} ...$ i.e.*

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^{big}\dot{\cup}\left(\dot{\bigcup}_{\ell=1}^{\infty}\mathcal{P}_\ell^{small}\right),$$

such that the collections $\mathcal{P}^{big}$ and $\mathcal{P}_\ell^{small}$ are admissible and satisfy

$$\sup_{\ell\geq 1}\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha\left(\mathcal{P}_\ell^{small}\right)^2 \leq \varepsilon\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha(\mathcal{P})^2, \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}} \leq C_\varepsilon\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha(\mathcal{P})^2 + \left(1+\sqrt{2}\right)\sup_{\ell\geq 1}\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}_\ell^{small}}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Let $\pi\mathcal{P} \equiv \pi_1\mathcal{P}\cup\pi_2\mathcal{P}$ denote the collection of all cubes occurring in the pairs in $\mathcal{P}$. Begin by defining the collection $\mathcal{K}$ to consist of the *minimal* dyadic cubes K in $\pi\mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{|K|_\sigma}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(K, \mathbf{1}_{A\setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|K|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2 \omega_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{T}(K)) \geq \varepsilon\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha(\mathcal{P})^2.$$

A key property of the the minimality requirement is that

$$\frac{1}{|K'|_\sigma}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(K', \mathbf{1}_{A\setminus K'}\sigma\right)}{|K'|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2 \omega_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{T}(K')) < \varepsilon\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha(\mathcal{P})^2, \tag{3.3}$$

for all $K' \in \pi\mathcal{P}$ with $K' \subsetneqq K$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}$.

We now perform a stopping time argument 'from the bottom up' with respect to the atomic measure $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ in the upper half space. This construction of a stopping time 'from the bottom up' is the first of two key innovations in Lacey's argument [**Lac**], the other being the recursion described below.

We refer to $\mathcal{K}$ as the initial or level 0 generation of stopping times and denote it by $\mathcal{L}_0$. Choose $\rho > 1$ which we will fix at the end of the proof. We then recursively define a sequence of generations $\{\mathcal{L}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ by letting $\mathcal{L}_n$ consist of the *minimal* dyadic cubes L in $\pi\mathcal{P}$ that contain a cube from $\mathcal{L}_{n-1}$ such that

$$\omega_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{T}(L)) \geq \rho\omega_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\bigcup_{L'\in\mathcal{L}_{n-1}:\ L'\subset L}\mathbf{T}(L')\right).$$

We now define the collections $\mathcal{P}^{small}$ and $\mathcal{P}_t^{big}$ for $t \geq 2$. First, let $\mathcal{L} \equiv \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{L}_n$ be the tree of stopping energy intervals defined above, and for $L \in \mathcal{L}$, denote by $\mathcal{C}_L$

the corona associated with L in $\mathcal{L}$. Then for $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ and $0 \leq t \leq n$ define

$$\mathcal{P}_{L,t} \equiv \left\{ (I,J) \in \mathcal{P} : I \in \mathcal{C}_L \text{ and } J \in \mathcal{C}_{L'} \text{ for some } L' \in \mathcal{L}_{n-t} \right\} .,$$

In particular, $(I,J) \in \mathcal{P}_{L,t}$ implies that I is in the corona $\mathcal{C}_L$, and that J is in a corona t levels of generation below $\mathcal{C}_L$. For $t=0$ we further decompose $\mathcal{P}_{L,0}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{L,0} &= \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{small} \dot{\cup} \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big}; \\ \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{small} &\equiv \left\{ (I,J) \in \mathcal{P}_{L,0} : I \neq L \right\}, \\ \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big} &\equiv \left\{ (I,J) \in \mathcal{P}_{L,0} : I = L \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^{big} &\equiv \left\{ \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big} \right\} \bigcup \left\{ \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{L,t} \right\}; \\ \mathcal{P}_{\ell}^{small} &\equiv \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{small}, \qquad \text{after relabeling.} \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have omitted the exceptional pairs (I,J) in

$$\mathcal{P}^{except} \equiv \mathcal{P} \setminus \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \bigcup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_{L,t}$$

for which I is not in any corona $\mathcal{C}_L$; but estimating these exceptional pairs is no harder, see [**Lac**] for details in the one-dimensional case, and the ideas carry over without difficulty here. So it remains to prove the inequalities (3.1) and (3.2).

To prove the inequality (3.1), it suffices with the above relabelling to prove the following claim:

$$\mathcal{E}_A^{\alpha} \left(\mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{small} \right)^2 \leq (\rho - 1) \, \mathcal{E}_A^{\alpha} (\mathcal{P})^2, \qquad L \in \mathcal{L}. \tag{3.4}$$

To see the claim, suppose first that $L = K \in \mathcal{L}_0$ is an initial generation interval. Then for every pair $(I,J) \in \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{small}$ we have from (3.3) that

$$\mathcal{E}_A^{\alpha} \left(\mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{small} \right)^2 \leq \sup_{K' \in \mathcal{C}_K \setminus \{K\}} \frac{1}{|K'|_{\sigma}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha} \left(K', \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus K'} \sigma \right)}{|K'|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\mathbf{T} \left(K' \right) \right) \leq \varepsilon \mathcal{E}_A^{\alpha} (\mathcal{P})^2 .$$

Now suppose that $L \in \mathcal{L}_t$ for $t \geq 1$ and pick a pair $(I,J) \in \mathcal{P}_{L,t}^{small}$. Then both I and J are in the *strict* corona $\mathcal{C}_L \setminus \{L\}$. By the definition of stopping times,

$$\omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\mathbf{T} (K) \right) < \rho \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\bigcup_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{t-1} : \, L' \subset K} \mathbf{T} (L') \right), \qquad K \subsetneqq L.$$

Now we use the crucial fact that $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ is *additive* to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\mathbf{T} (K) \setminus \bigcup_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{t-1} : \, L' \subset K} \mathbf{T} (L') \right) &= \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\mathbf{T} (K) \right) - \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\bigcup_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{t-1} : \, L' \subset K} \mathbf{T} (L') \right) \\ &\leq (\rho - 1) \, \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\bigcup_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{t-1} : \, L' \subset K} \mathbf{T} (L') \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha\left(\mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{small}\right)^2 &= \sup_{K\in\mathcal{C}_L\setminus\{L\}} \frac{1}{|K|_\sigma}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(K,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|K|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2 \omega_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\mathbf{T}(K)\setminus\bigcup_{L'\in\mathcal{L}_{t-1}:\ L'\subset K}\mathbf{T}(L')\right)\\
&\leq (\rho-1)\sup_{K\in\mathcal{C}_L\setminus\{L\}} \frac{1}{|K|_\sigma}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(K,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|K|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2 \omega_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\bigcup_{L'\in\mathcal{L}_{t-1}:\ L'\subset K}\mathbf{T}(L')\right)\\
&\leq (\rho-1)\sup_{K\in\mathcal{C}_L\setminus\{L\}} \frac{1}{|K|_\sigma}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(K,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|K|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2 \omega_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\mathbf{T}(K)\right)\\
&\leq (\rho-1)\,\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha(\mathcal{P})^2\,,
\end{aligned}$$

and this completes the proof of (3.4), hence also of (3.1).

To prove the other inequality (3.2), we need a lemma to bound the norm of certain stopping forms, and we interrupt the proof to turn to this matter. □

3.1. The straddling lemma. Given a collection $\mathcal{S}$ of pairwise disjoint cubes in A, and an admissible collection of pairs $\mathcal{P}$ for A, we say that $\mathcal{P}$ *straddles* $\mathcal{S}$ if for every pair $(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}$ there is $S\in\mathcal{S}\cap[J,I]$ where $[J,I]$ denotes the geodesic in the dyadic tree D that connects J to I. Such a 'stradding' collection occurs in the recursive proof of Proposition 6 in the section on boundedness of the $\mathcal{MBF}/L^2$ stopping form in Part 1.

LEMMA 29. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a subpartition of A, and suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is an admissible collection of pairs for A that straddles $\mathcal{S}$.*

1. *We furthermore suppose that one of the following cases holds:*
   - (a) *Case **in**: for each pair $(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}$ we have*

$$J\Subset S \text{ whenever } J\subset S; \tag{3.5}$$

   - (b) *Case **out**: for each pair $(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}$ we have*

$$S\Subset I \text{ whenever } S\subset I. \tag{3.6}$$

2. *Then we have the stopping form bound*

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}\leq C\left\{\begin{array}{lll}\eta_{\mathbf{in}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S}) & in & Case\ \mathbf{in}\\ \eta_{\mathbf{out}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S}) & in & Case\ \mathbf{out}\end{array}\right.,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\mathbf{in}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S})^2 &\equiv \sup_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\frac{1}{|S|_\sigma}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\langle\mathbf{x},h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_\omega\right|^2;\\
\eta_{\mathbf{out}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S})^2 &\equiv \sup_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\frac{1}{|S|_\sigma}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(S,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|S|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{J\in\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\langle\mathbf{x},h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_\omega\right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in the definition of $\eta_{\mathbf{in}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S})^2$, unlike in the definition for $\eta_{\mathbf{out}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S})^2$ and the stopping energy $\mathcal{E}_A(\mathcal{P})^2$, the fractional Poisson term $\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}$ depends on J and so occurs *inside* the sum over $\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}$, accounting for the terminology. Of course, we trivially have $\eta_{\mathbf{out}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S})\leq\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha(\mathcal{P})$, noting that we are omitting dependence of $\eta_{\mathbf{in/out}}$ on α. The proof below of Lemma 29 follows that of a similar result in previously unpublished work of the authors with M. Lacey on the restricted weak type inequality for the Hilbert transform.

Proof. We begin by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}(f,g) &= \sum_{J\in\pi_2\mathcal{P}}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left\langle T_\sigma^\alpha\varphi_J,\triangle_J^{\omega,a}g\right\rangle_\omega ; \\ \text{where } \varphi_J &\equiv \sum_{I\in\pi_1\mathcal{P}:\ (I,J)\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_I^\sigma\left(\triangle_{\pi I}^\sigma f\right)\ \mathbf{1}_{A\setminus I}\ . \end{aligned}$$

By the telescoping property of martingale differences, together with the bounded fluctuation property of f, we have

$$|\varphi_J|\lesssim\alpha(A)\,. \tag{3.7}$$

Now since $J\Subset S$, we can apply the Monotonicity Lemma 3, and then use this with (3.7) and

$$\left\langle \mathbf{x},\triangle_J^{\omega,a}g\right\rangle_\omega=\left\langle \mathbf{x},\left\langle g,h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_\omega h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_\omega=\left\langle g,h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle\left\langle \mathbf{x},h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_\omega ,$$

to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}(f,g)\right|^2 &= \left|\sum_{J\in\pi_2\mathcal{P}}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left\langle T_\sigma^\alpha\varphi_J,\triangle_J^{\omega,a}g\right\rangle_\omega\right|^2 \\ \lesssim\ & \alpha(A)^2\left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle \mathbf{x},\triangle_J^{\omega,a}g\right\rangle_\omega\right|\right)^2 \\ \leq\ & \alpha(A)^2\left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle \mathbf{x},h_K^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_\omega\right|\left|\left\langle g,h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle\right|\right) \\ \leq\ & \alpha(A)^2\left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle \mathbf{x},h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_\omega\right|^2\right)\left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle g,h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle\right|^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus in the **in** case (3.5) we have that $\left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}}(f,g)\right|^2$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha(A)^2\left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}|S|_\sigma\left\{\frac{1}{|S|_\sigma}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^S\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle \mathbf{x},h_K^{\omega,a}\right\rangle_\omega\right|^2\right\}\right) \\ &\qquad\qquad\times\left(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\left\langle g,h_J^{\omega,a}\right\rangle\right|^2\right) \\ \leq\ & \alpha(A)^2\,\eta_{\mathbf{in}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S})^2\left(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}}|S|_\sigma\right)\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2\leq\eta_{\mathbf{in}}(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S})^2\,\alpha(A)^2\,\beta\,|A|_\sigma\,\|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2\,, \end{aligned}$$

and this completes the proof of the lemma in the **in** case (3.5).

In the **out** case (3.6) we must exploit the assumption (3.6) by considering the collection $\mathcal{K}$ of *minimal* cubes $K\in\pi_1^S\mathcal{P}$. Then each $S\in\mathcal{S}$ is contained in a unique $K\in\mathcal{K}$, and moreover $S\Subset K$. Thus for each $(I,J)\in\mathcal{P}$, there are unique cubes

$S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $J \subset S \Subset K \subset I$. Then from the Poisson inequalities

$$\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus I}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \leq \frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \lesssim \frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(S, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|S|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \leq \frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(S, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|S|^{\frac{1}{n}}},$$

(where the middle inequality holds because $J \subset S \Subset K$) we obtain that $\left|\mathsf{B}_{stop}\left(f,g\right)\right|^2$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \alpha\left(A\right)^2 \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}:\ S \subset K} \sum_{J \in \pi_2^S \mathcal{P}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(J, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right) \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \left| \langle x, \triangle_J^{\omega,a} g \rangle_{\omega} \right| \right)^2 \\
&\leq \alpha\left(A\right)^2 \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}:\ S \subset K} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(S, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus K}\sigma\right)}{|S|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\mathbf{T}\left(S\right)\right) \right) \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \alpha\left(A\right)^2 \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |K|_{\sigma} \left\{ \frac{1}{|K|_{\sigma}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}:\ S \subset K} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^{\alpha}\left(S, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|S|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\mathbf{T}\left(S\right)\right) \right\} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \alpha\left(A\right)^2 \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |K|_{\sigma} \right) \eta_{\mathbf{out}}\left(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S}\right)^2 \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \leq \eta_{\mathbf{out}}\left(\mathcal{P};\mathcal{S}\right)^2 \alpha\left(A\right)^2 \beta \left|A\right|_{\sigma} \|g\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \ .
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 29. □

3.2. Completion of the proof.

Now we return to the proof of inequality (3.2) in Proposition 10.

Proof. (of (3.2)): Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}^{big} &= \left\{ \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big} \right\} \bigcup \left\{ \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{L,t} \right\} = \mathcal{Q}_0^{big} \bigcup \mathcal{Q}_1^{big}; \\
\mathcal{Q}_0^{big} &\equiv \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big}\ , \qquad \mathcal{Q}_1^{big} \equiv \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \mathcal{P}_t^{big}.
\end{aligned}$$

We first consider the collection $\mathcal{Q}_0^{big} = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big}$, and decompose it as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_0^{big} &= \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_n} \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big} \right\} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_n^{big}; \\
\mathcal{R}_n^{big} &\equiv \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_n} \mathcal{P}_{L,0}^{big}\ , \qquad n \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We first claim that

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{R}_n^{big}} \leq C \mathcal{E}_A^{\alpha}\left(\mathcal{P}\right), \qquad n \geq 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Indeed, let $n \geq 0$ and consider $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$. Let $\mathcal{M}^L$ be the collection of maximal good subintervals of L that lie in $\pi_2 \mathcal{P}$; i.e. M is in $\mathcal{M}^L$ if $M \in \pi_2^L \mathcal{P}$, $M \Subset L$ and if there is no interval $J \in \pi_2^L \mathcal{P}$ with $J \supsetneqq M$. We now apply Case **in** of Lemma 29 with

$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{L}_n$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{R}_n^{big}} &\leq C\eta_{\mathbf{in}}\left(\mathcal{R}_n^{big};\mathcal{K}\right) = C\sup_{L\in\mathcal{L}_n}\sqrt{\frac{1}{|L|_\sigma}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^L\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus L}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\langle x,h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_\omega\right|^2} \\
&\leq C\sup_{L\in\mathcal{L}_n}\sqrt{\frac{1}{|L|_\sigma}\sum_{M\in\mathcal{M}^L}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^L\mathcal{P}:\ J\subset M}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus L}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\langle x,h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_\omega\right|^2} \\
&\leq C\sup_{L\in\mathcal{L}_n}\sqrt{\frac{1}{|L|_\sigma}\sum_{M\in\mathcal{M}^L}|M|_\sigma\left\{\frac{1}{|M|_\sigma}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^L\mathcal{P}:\ J\subset M}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus L}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\sum_{a\in\Gamma_n}\left|\langle x,h_J^{\omega,a}\rangle_\omega\right|^2\right\}} \\
&\leq C\sup_{L\in\mathcal{L}_n}\sqrt{\frac{1}{|L|_\sigma}\sum_{M\in\mathcal{M}^L}|M|_\sigma\left\{\frac{1}{|M|_\sigma}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(M,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus M}\sigma\right)}{|M|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\right\}} \\
&\leq C\sup_{L\in\mathcal{L}_n}\sqrt{\frac{1}{|L|_\sigma}\left(\sum_{M\in\mathcal{M}^L}|M|_\sigma\right)\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha\left(\mathcal{P}\right)^2} \leq C\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha\left(\mathcal{P}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (3.8). Finally, we observe that the collections $\mathcal{R}_n^{big}$ are *mutually orthogonal*, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_n^{big} &\subset \bigcup_{L\in\mathcal{L}_n}\left\{\mathcal{C}_L\times\mathcal{C}_L\right\}\equiv\mathcal{A}_n\ , \\
\mathcal{A}_n\cap\mathcal{A}_{n'} &= \emptyset, \qquad n\neq n',
\end{aligned}$$

and a simple orthogonality argument, see [**Lac**], then shows that

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{Q}_0^{big}} \leq \sqrt{2}\sup_{n\geq 0}\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{R}_n^{big}} \leq \sqrt{2}C.$$

Now we turn to the collection $\mathcal{Q}_1^{big} \equiv \bigcup_{t\geq 1}\mathcal{P}_t^{big} = \bigcup_{t\geq 1}\bigcup_{L\in\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{P}_{L,t}$, and further decompose it as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_1^{big} &= \bigcup_{t\geq 1}\bigcup_{L\in\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{P}_{L,t} = \bigcup_{t\geq 1}\mathcal{S}_t^{big}; \\
\mathcal{S}_t^{big} &\equiv \bigcup_{L\in\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{P}_{L,t}\ , \qquad t\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{S}_t^{big}} \leq C\rho^{-\frac{t}{2}}\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha\left(\mathcal{P}\right), \qquad t\geq 1. \tag{3.9}$$

Note that with this claim established, we have

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{P}^{big}} \leq \mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{Q}_0^{big}} + \mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{Q}_1^{big}} \leq \mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{Q}_0^{big}} + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{S}_t^{big}} \leq C_\rho\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha\left(\mathcal{P}\right),$$

which proves (3.2). Now the proof of Proposition 10 is completed by taking $\rho = 1+\varepsilon$.

Thus it remains only to show that (3.9) holds. The cases $1 \leq t \leq r+1$ can be handled with relative ease, see [**Lac**], so we consider only the case $t \geq r+2$. In this case we can further decompose $\mathcal{S}_t^{big}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_t^{big} &= \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{L,t} = \bigcup_{n=r+2}^{\infty} \left\{ \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_n} \mathcal{P}_{L,t} \right\} = \bigcup_{n=r+2}^{\infty} \mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}; \\
\mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big} &\equiv \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_n} \mathcal{P}_{L,t} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Case **out** of Lemma 29 to $\mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}$ with $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{L}_{n-r-1}$ to obtain

$$\mathfrak{N}_{stop}^{\mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}} \leq C\eta_{\mathbf{out}} \left(\mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}; \mathcal{L}_{n-r-1} \right), \qquad t \geq 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Finally, fix $S \in \mathcal{C}_L$ with $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$, and use the fact that L' lies at least r coronas below S, i.e. $L' \in \mathcal{L}_k$ with $k \leq n-r$, to obtain that L' is a good subcube of S, hence a Whitney subcube of S, and so satisfies the Poisson estimate

$$\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha \left(J, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus S} \sigma \right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \leq C \frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha \left(L', \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus S} \sigma \right)}{|L'|^{\frac{1}{n}}}, \qquad J \subset L'.$$

Thus we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|S|_\sigma} \sum_{J \in \pi_2^L \mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}:\ J \subset S} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha \left(J, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus S} \sigma \right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \left| \langle \mathbf{x}, h_J^{\omega,a} \rangle_\omega \right|^2 \\
= & \frac{1}{|S|_\sigma} \sum_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{n-r}:\ L' \subset S} \ \sum_{J \in \pi_2^{L'} \mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha \left(J, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus S} \sigma \right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \left| \langle \mathbf{x}, h_J^{\omega,a} \rangle_\omega \right|^2 \\
\leq & \frac{1}{|S|_\sigma} \sum_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{n-r}:\ L' \subset S} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha \left(L', \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus L'} \sigma \right)}{|L'|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \left\{ \sum_{J \in \pi_2^{L'} \mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}} \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \left| \langle \mathbf{x}, h_J^{\omega,a} \rangle_\omega \right|^2 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now a simple induction on levels yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{J \in \pi_2^{L'} \mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}} \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \left| \langle \mathbf{x}, h_J^{\omega,a} \rangle_\omega \right|^2 &\leq \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\bigcup_{L'' \in \mathcal{L}_{n-t}:\ L'' \subset L'} \mathbf{T}\left(L''\right) \right) \\
&\lesssim \rho^{-(t-r)} \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\mathbf{T}\left(L'\right) \right), \qquad t \geq r+2,
\end{aligned}$$

and so altogether we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|S|_\sigma} \sum_{J \in \pi_2^L \mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}:\ J \subset S} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha \left(J, \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus S} \sigma \right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \sum_{a \in \Gamma_n} \left| \langle \mathbf{x}, h_J^{\omega,a} \rangle_\omega \right|^2 \\
\lesssim & \ \rho^{-(t-r)} \frac{1}{|S|_\sigma} \sum_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{n-r}:\ L' \subset S} \left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha \left(L', \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus L'} \sigma \right)}{|L'|^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^2 \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\mathbf{T}\left(L'\right) \right) \\
\lesssim & \ \rho^{-(t-r)} \frac{1}{|S|_\sigma} \left(\sum_{L' \in \mathcal{L}_{n-r}:\ L' \subset S} |L'|_\sigma \right) \mathcal{E}_A^\alpha \left(\mathcal{P} \right) \lesssim \rho^{-t} \mathcal{E}_A^\alpha \left(\mathcal{P} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{\mathbf{out}}\left(\mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big};\mathcal{L}_{n-r-1}\right)^{2} &= \sup_{S\in\mathcal{C}_L}\frac{1}{|S|_\sigma}\sum_{J\in\pi_2^L\mathcal{S}_{t,n}^{big}:\ J\subset S}\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}^\alpha\left(J,\mathbf{1}_{A\setminus S}\sigma\right)}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^2\left|\langle\mathbf{x},h_J^\omega\rangle_\omega\right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \rho^{-t}\mathcal{E}_A^\alpha\left(\mathcal{P}\right)^2,\end{aligned}$$

and combined with 3.10 this gives (3.9), which as we pointed out above completes the proof of Lemma 10. □

This finishes our reproduction of Lacey's proof of the stopping form estimate (5.3). The proof of Theorem 3 is complete.

Bibliography

[DaJo] David, Guy, Journé, Jean-Lin, *A boundedness criterion for generalized Calderón-Zygmund operators,* Ann. of Math. (2) **120** (1984), 371–397, MR763911 (85k:42041).

[HyPeTrVo] T. Hytönen, C. Pérez, S. Treil and A. Volberg, Sharp weighted estimates for dyadic shifts and the A_2 conjecture, `arXiv 1010.0755v2`.

[Lac] Lacey, Michael T., *On the two weight Hilbert transform inequality*, `arXiv:1301.4663v1` (2013).

[LaSaUr1] Lacey, Michael T., Sawyer, Eric T., Uriarte-Tuero, Ignacio, *A characterization of two weight norm inequalities for maximal singular integrals,* `arxiv:0807.0246` (2008).

[LaSaUr] Lacey, Michael T., Sawyer, Eric T., Uriarte-Tuero, Ignacio, *A Two Weight Inequality for the Hilbert transform assuming an energy hypothesis,* `arXiv:` (2011).

[LaSaShUr] Lacey, Michael T., Sawyer, Eric T., Shen, Chun-Yen, Uriarte-Tuero, Ignacio, *The Two weight inequality for Hilbert transform, coronas, and energy conditions,* `arXiv:` (2011).

[LaSaShUr2] Lacey, Michael T., Sawyer, Eric T., Shen, Chun-Yen, Uriarte-Tuero, Ignacio, *Two Weight Inequality for the Hilbert Transform: A Real Variable Characterization,* `arXiv:1201.4319` (2012).

[HuMuWh] R. Hunt, B. Muckenhoupt and R. L. Wheeden, *Weighted norm inequalities for the conjugate function and the Hilbert transform*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **176** (1973), 227-251.

[Hyt] Hyt{\"o}nen, Tuomas, *On Petermichl's dyadic shift and the Hilbert transform*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **346** (2008), MR2464252.

[LySe] Y. I. Lyubarskii and K. Seip, *Complete interpolating sequences for Paley-Weiner spaces and Muckenhoupt's A_p condition,* Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **13** (1997), no. 2, 361-376. MR1617649 (99e 42004).

[NaVo] F. Nazarov and A. Volberg, *The Bellman function, the two weight Hilbert transform, and the embeddings of the model space K_θ*, J. d'Analyse Math. **87** (2002), 385-414.

[NTV1] F. Nazarov, S. Treil and A. Volberg, *The Bellman function and two weight inequalities for Haar multipliers*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1999), 909-928, MR{1685781 (2000k:42009)}.

[NTV2] Nazarov, F., Treil, S. and Volberg, A., *The Tb-theorem on non-homogeneous spaces,* Acta Math. **190** (2003), no. 2, MR 1998349 (2005d:30053).

[NTV4] F. Nazarov, S. Treil and A. Volberg, *Two weight estimate for the Hilbert transform and corona decomposition for non-doubling measures*, preprint (2004) `arxiv:1003.1596`

[NiTr] N. Nikolski and S. Treil, *Linear resolvent growth of rank one perturbation of a unitary operator does not imply its similarity to a normal operator*, J. Anal. Math. 87 (2002), 415–431. MR1945291.

[Saw1] E. Sawyer, *A characterization of a two-weight norm inequality for maximal operators*, Studia Math. **75** (1982), 1-11, MR{676801 (84i:42032)}.

[Saw3] E. Sawyer, *A characterization of two weight norm inequalities for fractional and Poisson integrals*, Trans. A.M.S. **308** (1988), 533-545, MR{930072 (89d:26009)}.

[Saw] E. Sawyer, An expanded version of '*Two Weight Inequality for the Hilbert Transform: A Real Variable Characterization, arXiv:1201.4319 (2012).' posted on the author's website http://www.math.mcmaster.ca/~sawyer/ (2012).*

[SaWh] E. Sawyer and R. L. Wheeden, Weighted inequalities for fractional integrals on Euclidean and homogeneous spaces, *Amer. J. Math.* **114** (1992), 813-874.

[Ste] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1993.

[Vol] A. Volberg, *Calderón-Zygmund capacities and operators on nonhomogeneous spaces,* CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics (2003), MR{2019058 (2005c:42015)}.